

① Ap: 5th 1787 from the
Author W. Gray.

DOCTOR PRICE'S

NOTIONS of the NATURE

OF

CIVIL LIBERTY,

SHEWN TO BE CONTRADICTIONARY TO

REASON AND SCRIPTURE.

By John Gray.

— England never did and never will lie at the proud foot
of a conqueror, but when she first does help to wound
herself. *Shakespeare.*

Amicus Plato; sed magis amica veritas.

L O N D O N,

Printed for T. BECKET, at the Corner of the
ADELPHI, in the STRAND.

MDCCLXXVII.

1046-38

5432.4-3

~~Br 9063.5~~

Br 2027.77.3670

Harvard College Library,
Lord Rivers Pamphlet Collection.
Gift of Mrs. L. Bettman,
Feb. 28, 1903.

HARVARD
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

CIVIL LIBERTY

SHOWN TO BE CONTRASTED TO

REASON AND SCRIPTURE

—The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been named in the above mentioned pamphlet as being in the possession of the same.

And the names of the persons who have been named in the above mentioned pamphlet as being in the possession of the same.

OF THE
HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
AND THE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

TO
THOSE MEMBERS
OF THE
COMMON COUNCIL OF LONDON,
WHO HAVE DECLARED THEMSELVES
THE PATRONS OF
IRRELIGION AND SEDITION,
THE FOLLOWING DISCOURSE
IS EARNESTLY ADDRESSED
BY
THE AUTHOR,
JOHN GRAY.

TO
THOSE MEMBERS
OF THE
COMMONS OF GREAT BRITAIN
WHO HAVE BEEN
THE
INTERESTED
THE
IS
THE
THE
JOHN GRAY

DOCTOR PRICE'S
NOTIONS OF THE NATURE OF
CIVIL LIBERTY,
SHEWN TO BE CONTRADICTIONARY TO
REASON AND SCRIPTURE.

DOCTOR PRICE begins his observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, by telling his readers, " That our Colonies in
" America appear to be now determined to
" do and suffer every thing, under the persuasion that Great Britain is attempting to rob
" them of that liberty, to which every member
" of society, and all civil communities, have
" a natural and unalienable right." The whole purport of the Doctor's pamphlet is to prove, that this *persuasion* is well grounded; and therefore that the war on the part of the Colonies is a just war, and iniquitous on the part of government. But how does he attempt

to prove that? By arguments founded on sophistry; by ignorant misrepresentation, and seditious declamation. The Doctor confesses that most of his arguments are not new; and most assuredly they are not; for many of the propositions he advances have been produced and refuted three or four times over within these few years past. But as he has again brought them into the field, and marshalled them in one body, with some reinforcements of his own, he may, perhaps, vainly flatter himself that they have acquired such strength as to be irresistible. Let us therefore examine them by the standard of truth, of reason, of scripture, and of the principles of the constitution. If they be found not to accord with any of these, my readers will easily judge what value to set upon them, and will perceive that the *persuasion*, which he thinks well grounded, is altogether a groundless and false *persuasion*, that can only harbour in the breasts of the ignorant or factious.

The Doctor opens his discourse with a few definitions of different kinds of liberty, namely, of *physical*, *moral*, *religious*, and *civil liberty*, the last of which only appears to have any reference to the dispute about the submission of colonists to the supreme legislature of the state, of which they are members. I say appears; for upon a strict examination of what he calls Civil Liberty, we shall find it to mean either the legislative independence of one state in respect to another, or else a most crude indistinct notion of a state of society

society that has no where any existence. First,
 “ Civil Liberty, according to his definition,
 “ is the power of a civil society, community,
 “ or state, to govern itself by its own discretion,
 “ or by laws of its own making, without being
 “ subject to any foreign discretion, or to the
 “ impositions of any extraneous will or power.”

This is his first definition of Civil Liberty, in pages third and fourth, in which, with the utmost inaccuracy, he leaves it entirely to be guessed at what he means by *foreign discretion*, and whether the terms *civil society*, *community*, and *state* stand as synonymous, or are to be taken in a disjunctive sense; for though every state is a civil society, every society or community is not a state. Thus far however it would seem that by Civil Liberty, the Doctor means the *legislative independence* of one state upon another; and in this sense I affirm the consideration of it has nothing at all to do with the submission of colonists to the supreme legislature of their parent state. But mark the jesuitical sophistry of the Doctor. Throughout the rest of his performance, he drops this first sense of the term Civil Liberty, and wherever there is any reference to it, he always implies by it, the legislative independence of individuals in respect to each other, which is altogether incompatible with every state of civil society. Thus, he tells us, that without Civil Liberty, man is a “*poor*, “ *abject* animal, without *rights*,” which cannot possibly have any respect to his first definition of

Civil Liberty. Again, he says, "In every
 " free state every man is his own legislator. All
 " laws are particular provisions established by
 " *common consent*. If the laws are not made by
 " common consent, a government by them does
 " not differ from slavery," &c. &c.

The Doctor seems highly satisfied with his accurate definitions, which he wishes his readers to pay great attention to, and then rises into a declamatory rant in praise of Dear Liberty, "according to the representation he has made
 " of it." Now it already plainly appears that his *representation of it*, is remarkable for nothing but inaccuracy and absurdity, and that however dogmatically he undertakes to explain it to others, he himself has nothing but the most blundering notions about it; for in the space of two pages we have Civil Liberty declared to be two different things; first, the legislative independence of one state upon another, and then the legislative independence of the individuals of a society in respect to each other, which last is absolute nonsense, and exists no where upon earth.

So much for the inaccuracy of the Doctor's definitions of Civil Liberty. His wonderful absurdity and confusion of ideas will be still more apparent, when we consider the inaccuracy of his general division of liberty. He begins his first section with telling us, that in order to obtain a more distinct and accurate view of Liberty as such, it will be useful to consider it
 under

under the four following divisions: first, Physical Liberty.—Secondly, Moral Liberty.—Thirdly, Religious Liberty, and—Fourthly, Civil Liberty. Now with the same propriety he might have made a general division of liberty, consisting of ten, of fifteen, or of twenty different heads; for when one is so ignorant as to arrange things of a different nature under the same class, he needs not much confine himself in his enumeration. That the Doctor has been so ignorant will appear by his own definitions. His three first definitions of Liberty regard man as an individual; when, all at once, he takes a leap to a fourth definition, which has nothing to do with the Liberty of the individual, but regards only the independence of one community upon another. With the same propriety, when explaining the nature of iron, he might leap to the explanation of the nature of a clock, because it is composed of pieces of iron. With the same propriety an architect in specifying the kinds of stones used in London, might tell us there are four kinds, namely, granite, Portland stone, Purbeck stone, and a church, which is composed of stones; or a cabinet-maker might enumerate the kinds of wood he was in possession of, by saying that he had in his shop four kinds, oak, ash, elm, and a chest of drawers.

The perplexing obscurity of Doctor Price, and his vain parade of science, may create admiration in the ignorant, but they vanish at once in considering Liberty in regard to man, as

an

an individual, under the three following general heads, namely, Physical Liberty, Religious Liberty, and Natural Liberty. The two first, that is, *Physical* and *Religious Liberty*, are for ever inalienable to man. But the last, or *Natural Liberty*, so far from being inalienable, is actually resigned up, or alienated by every man, the moment he becomes a member of civil society. *Qui civis fit*, according to Puffendorf, *libertatis naturalis jacturam facit*, the literal translation of which is, Whoever enters into civil society, throws his *Natural Liberty* overboard. That is to say, should a law be made in society, to the enacting of which the individual refuses his consent, he is nevertheless in duty bound to submit to that law, when he has not the majority of the state of his opinion. The case is the same with three millions of individuals as with one individual, while the majority of the state think differently from them.

Doctor Price, incapable of discriminating the various gradations of liberty that subsist in civilized states, presumptuously talks of having *laid the line* between liberty and slavery; and most absurdly deems all those slaves, who, in a state of society, do not possess the same freedom of will as in a state of natural liberty, though we have seen, that it is only by a renunciation of *natural liberty*, that man can possess *political liberty*. But I would ask Doctor Price, is liberty all-white, and slavery all-black, that a line may so easily be laid in the point of transition from the one

to the other? Is there no *crepuscule* or twilight between the enlightened hemisphere and the darkened? As easily may Doctor Price fix the moment when night ends and day begins, as lay the line to determine what is liberty and what is slavery. As soon might he convince mankind, that there are but two colours in the world, as persuade them that the transition from liberty to slavery may be marked by a line, or made at one step. In truth, and in fact, the gradations of liberty, in civilized states, are infinite, like the tints of colours; and it is only the two or three last degradations of it, if I may be allowed the expression, that are by the universal concurrence of men called slavery.

Among the free Romans the liberty of the Patricians was certainly different from that of the Plebeians; the *Jus Romanum* was one thing, and the *Jus Latinum* another; and both these differed from the *Jus Italicum*, the *Jus Municipale*, the *Jus Coloniarum*, &c. So likewise among the Free Britons, the liberty of the nobility is different from the liberty of the commons; the liberty of the clergy is different from that of the laity; the liberty of the land-holder is different from that of the land-renter. But happy and honourable for British colonists, their liberties are exactly the same with those of Britons of the same rank and degree, though the case was very different with Roman colonists, who had neither the *jus suffragiorum* nor the

the *jus honorum*, that is, they could neither *elect* nor be *elected* into public offices of the state.

Doctor Price, in presumptuously taking upon him *to lay the line* between liberty and slavery, does not blush to differ in opinion from St. Paul, who, though he stood on the side of the Doctor's line marked for slavery, boldly declares himself a FREEMAN FREEBORN; and very justly he might; for as a *Roman*, not as a *Jew*, his liberty was very great, and he inherited many distinguishing privileges; though, had he lived in the times of the republic, he could not have borne any public office in the state. In like manner, before the present disturbances in America, there was not a British subject on that continent, but might as a *Briton*, not as an *American*, have declared that he was a FREEMAN FREEBORN, with this distinguishing advantage, in preference to a Roman colonist, that all the offices of state were accessible to him.

It is none of the smallest absurdities of the Doctor, in this first section, that he has presumed to be an innovator in the English language, as well as in the fundamental principles of government. Before Doctor Price's days, the term Civil Liberty always implied the degree of relative liberty, which men enjoyed in a state of society under whatever form of government they lived. But it is altogether new, and may, I think, be termed an abuse of language to understand by Civil Liberty, the legislative independence of one state in respect to another.

The

The term *Civil War* has ever been understood as meaning the war of fellow-citizens with each other ; but for the future, if we reason by analogy from Dr. Price's definition, *Civil War* must mean the war of one state against another. What a wonderful improvement of language !

Upon reading the Doctor's title page, announcing *Observations on Civil Liberty*, I expected to find in his performance a just and well arranged comparison of the liberty enjoyed by subjects under the British form of government, with the liberty which subjects are allowed under other forms of government, commonly called free governments. I expected to find the most perfect degree of *Civil Liberty* declared to be that, where, by wise laws, the least abridgment was made of *Natural Liberty*, in regard to the three essential points of *freedom of person, freedom of property, and freedom of speech*. I expected to find the warmest encomiums bestowed upon the British constitution, for a sacred regard to those three branches of Liberty ; with a remark, that the blasted tree of Liberty raised by the rebels bore no such branches. What then was my surprise, to find Dr. Price declaring Civil Liberty to be legislative independence ! and that the freedom and happiness of a community consisted in being self-governed. Who is there in this island that would not rather be mildly governed by a law from China, than tyrannized over by a fellow-townsmen or a fellow-countryman ? and yet

yet, according to Dr. Price, the will of the majority implies perfect freedom to a community.

But the history of all ages and nations shews us, that where Dr. Price's Civil Liberty has prevailed, both personal liberty and liberty of property have often been wanting. Let us but look into the free governments of Greece, of Rome, of Carthage, and even of Great Britain some hundreds of years ago, and we find thousands deprived both of personal liberty, and liberty of property, though they were living in the bosom of states enjoying Doctor Price's Civil Liberty. Let us also look into the Republics of Holland, of Venice, of Genoa, of Berne, of Geneva, those models of human felicity according to the ideal opinions of some politicians, who think that *republic* and *public welfare* are synonymous terms. I will venture to affirm that such acts of despotism are every year committed in the three first of those republics by the rulers towards the governed, and submitted to by them, as would be deemed by Britons absolute slavery. As to Berne, who that has the slightest acquaintance with that republic does not know that it has dependent provinces or bailiages, which are great objects of ambition among the *notables*, and where the bailiffs, and, I might add, *mesdames les bailives*, with revenues from fifty pounds to two hundred, assume an almost proconsular and prætorian authority, which the British constitution is unacquainted with. As to Geneva, which possesses a territory not a fifth-

part

part so extensive as the estate of the Duke of Northumberland, it enjoys the Doctor's Civil Liberty; but are the liberties of its subjects equal to those of British subjects? There is not a Genevois in London but will acknowledge they are not.

This Civil Liberty of Doctor Price is certainly a most charming thing for the *rulers*; but we have but too many proofs that it is not always so for the *ruled*. Let us suppose it actually brought to an establishment in the rebel colonies, would the colonists be more happy, more rich, or more secure, than they have experienced themselves to be as British subjects? If we may form a conclusion from the most arbitrary and despotic proceedings of the rebellious delegates of Philadelphia, we may declare that they would not. It may however be said, that these arbitrary acts are owing to the present state of actual war. But are the colonists so very short-sighted as not to perceive that they must have many such wars to sustain before their legislative independence be acknowledged, not only by Great Britain but by the rest of the world? And even then, after they have swallowed so many bitter draughts, will they find their constitutions mended? Will the individuals find their liberties either more enlarged, or better secured? Would they gain any essential advantage in regard to liberty, that they have not hitherto enjoyed? How many of the colonists may at this moment say to Doctor Price, a curse upon your

Civil Liberty ! Give us liberty of property and personal liberty ; we mean freedom of person and freedom of action according to the laws, which we formerly enjoyed. We have not time to trouble ourselves about who are the law-makers : we wish only to live under that government where liberty of property and personal liberty are most regarded *.

In

* The following extract from the report of the commissioners sent to the colonies by Charles II. a few years after his restoration, will shew that the blessing of all blessings, according to Dr. Price, called *Civil Liberty*, is not always such a blessing to the subject. " They" (that is the rulers among the Massachusetts who were assuming Dr. Price's *Civil Liberty* to themselves) " will not admit any who is not a member of their church to communion, nor their children to baptisme ; yet they will marry their children to those whome they will not admitt to baptisme, if they be rich. They did imprison and barbarously use Mr. Jourdan for baptizing children, as himself complained in his petition to the commissioners. Those whome they will not admitt to the communion they compell to come to their sermons by forcing from them five shillings for every neglect ; yet these men thought their paying one shilling for not coming to prayers in England, was an insupportable tyranny. They have put many Quakers to death of other provinces, for which also they are petitioned against. First they banished them as Quakers upon payn of death ; and then executed them for returning. They have beate some to jelly, and have been otherways exceeding cruell to others ; and they say that the King allows it in his letters to them. Indeed they have misconstrued all the King's letters to their own sence. They yet pray constantly for their persecuted brethren in England. They have many things in their laws derogatory to his Majesty's hon-

" nor,

In examining this first section, then, we find that the Doctor has presumed to give a meaning to the term Civil Liberty different from the commonly received meaning; that he has presumed to differ from St. Paul, in affirming that to be slavery which St. Paul declares to be liberty; that he has most illogically arranged different *genera* under the same class; and that he has ventured into the region of nonsense, in imagining that *natural liberty* and *political liberty* might exist together. What can we therefore conclude, but that his observations in this section are contradictory both to reason and scripture.

I shall now proceed to the consideration of his second section, which is intitled "Of Civil Liberty, and the Principles of Government," though when we consider the matter it contains, any other title would have suited it nearly as well. We advance but a few sentences in this, when we meet with the two following propositions, "in every free state, every man is his own legislator.—All taxes are free gifts for public services." Here the number of falsehoods is equal to the number of lines. *In every free state, every man is his own legislator.* Admirable! When was it that *in Israel every man did*

"nor, of which the commissioners made a breviat, and desired that they might be altered; but they have yet done nothing in it: among others, whoever keeps Christmas-day is to pay five pounds."

that

that which was right in his own eyes? According to Dr. Price, it was when Judea enjoyed the most perfect degree of Civil Liberty. According to the Bible, it was when the land was overrun with wickedness and profligacy, and a general anarchy had made the people lose the ideas of civilization and sink into semi-barbarians.

But I scorn to take the Dr. tripping in an expression. It is his dogmatical and seditious conclusions from ill-considered premises; and his factious declamations from no premises at all, that I think worthy of reprehension. By the preceding expression I shall take it for granted he means, that the will of the whole in every free state, gives law to the whole, or as he terms it, "All laws are particular regulations established by common consent." Still these propositions are equally false with the former. They may indeed serve for texts to the disturbers of the public peace; but a Christian teacher, and a mathematician, ought to see demonstration in them before he gives them the stamp of his authority; and that demonstration can only be found by producing instances of societies so governed. If the Dr. can produce no society so governed, it follows from his own definition that he does not know one free society on the face of the earth, or in other words that his own theory is an absurdity.

Theoretical propositions, till they be realized by practice, are mere children of the brain, and should

should they even be scientifically true, yet when we find it beyond the power of man to reduce them to practice, it is losing time to bestow much attention in the consideration of them. But should they relate to objects important to society; and at the same time should be found to be demonstrably false, they may be the causes of innumerable evils to men; and the authors of them, if they will not disclaim them, will be the deserved objects of public execration.

The Doctor, I take it, imagines his political theorem true in speculation, from the notion of the natural equality among men, which topic is a fine source of exclamation to him in the course of his pamphlet, as it has been to many others, since the days of Harrington to the present times. But ought he not to have been very sure of this *natural equality*, before he ventured to erect such an edifice upon it, which, when narrowly examined, will be found to be a *baseless fabric*. I affirm his theorem to be false from the clearest conviction of the *natural inequality* of men, which, though it may perhaps be an observation hitherto not much attended to, will, I doubt not by the reflecting reader, be acknowledged to be as incontrovertible as any proposition in Aristotle. Are all the trees of a forest of the same height and size? Every one will confess that they are not. Are all men born with the same natural talents and abilities? Daily observation proves that they are not. Can any thing then
be

hardly

be more natural than that from those varied talents or gifts of nature, the vigorous, the active, and industrious, should acquire wealth and influence; the indolent, inactive, and feeble, should procure a subsistence, and should stand in need of the protection of the others. By this it appears, that some men are rulers and others subjects by the very nature of man: and when we consider what is the true end of government, this system displays a beautiful arrangement worthy of the Supreme Being. We are told by the highest authority that government is *pro formidine malorum*, &c. for a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well; and can any thing be more admirable (since all men are not born equal) than that some should be born to be a terror to evil-doers, and a praise to them that do well. This does not include the least idea either of tyranny on one hand, or of slavery on the other; and according to this explication, government is truly the ordinance of God.

The *natural inequality* of men, a truth so evident to every observer, appears then to be the source of their *political inequality*, or the cause of the first institution of government. This simple institution God suffers to be modified a thousand ways; but in all those thousand modifications, there must in every single society be one center of union, otherwise it would be what it was not. It would be both one society and not one society. When the mass of people living in the same society augments, various subordinations take place,
and

and *artificial abilities* to protect and support, I mean wealth and opulence, succeed to the *natural abilities* of courage, activity, and industry ; though these last, when honourably exerted, have still a most powerful influence to introduce their possessors into magistracies and places of authority, while the opposite *natural* qualities will gradually sink the descendants of the most illustrious ancestors into the class of the lowest subjects ; artificial abilities being more permanent than natural abilities ; the influence of *ranks*, which is but another name for artificial abilities, will, therefore, in large societies, become so considerable, as to be substituted in place of the less permanent powers ; and in the British form of government the power of protecting, that is, of governing, is fixed in the *ranks* of Prince, of Nobles, of Gentry, of Freeholders, and Free Burgesses. But whatever be the form of the constitution of a state, the true object of government is, that the rulers should suppress and punish vice, and encourage and reward virtue, while, on the other hand, the subjects should live peaceably and quietly, and consequently happily ; or otherwise at their peril. The system above explained most naturally unfolds the cause of the dissolution of luxurious and corrupt governments, where vice, and profligacy of manners prevail ; for when viciousness is so universally predominant that the rulers are tainted with it, and make a point of honouring and rewarding vice, and discountenancing and

D

punish-

punishing virtue, dissolution as naturally follows in society as in a wooden building set in flames*.

According to the system I have explained, and which reason justifies, nature does not require that every man should be his own ruler ; but, according to Doctor Price, whoever does not enjoy Civil Liberty agreeable to his definition, or rather, to one of his definitions of it, that is, assist in making the laws that govern him, is a *poor abject animal, with no rights*. With no rights, dear Doctor ! I have just now proved, that the subjects in every civil state have a right to be encouraged in virtue, and protected against the attempts of wicked men ; and I am very sorry that the British government has so long withheld that right from her peaceable and well intentioned subjects in the colonies. The poor old woman of Macedon appears to have had truer notions of government than Doctor Price ; for when she petitioned King Philip for a redress of an injury that had been done her, and he slightly put her off by say-

* From what has been said, we may draw the following just conclusion, that those who affirm, the personal or moral or moral character of magistrates or governors, has nothing at all to do with their public character, advance an opinion directly contradictory to the true principles of government ; and might just as well affirm, that the best means to secure good health is to have corrupt blood in the veins. On the contrary, it may be laid down as a maxim, that the more rarely profligate characters rise to authority, the more permanent and fixt will the happiness of a state or community naturally be.

ing,

ing, it was below his notice, she very constitutionally replied, *What are you King for then?* which instantly awakened him to a sense of his duty. But a Doctor Price would have told her, "As you do not give your consent to the laws by which you are governed, *you have no rights.*" Oh, the blind infatuation of factious spirits!

Once more, to illustrate, by a practical case, the natural impossibility of even small states being ruled by the will of all the members that compose them, where private property is once established, let us suppose the island of Madeira equally divided among one thousand families, who arrive there, all young men and young women, with equal stocks, and equal authority: how long would that first equality subsist? not a dozen of years; for in that time we should find some families without any children, and others with eight or nine; some of an indolent turn, who would decline having any concern in public affairs, and others, with ambitious spirits, who would have engrossed more than their share; some who had doubled the value of their property by their unwearied activity and industry; others, of a wasteful spirit, who had squandered theirs, and were living miserably, or upon charity. Upon this last view, our Saviour's saying, *that you shall always have the poor with you*, appears not so much a prophecy as a maxim of true political foresight; for while communities subsist upon earth, there will be found in them

numbers of indolent, inactive, thoughtless creatures, who will give their fellow-subjects the trouble of feeding and supporting them. And is it not curious to hear people affirm, that these have a natural right to be rulers, that is, protectors, when in fact their *natural right* is that of being protected by others. Is it not infinitely more probable that, in a generation or two, the inequality of conditions in this small state, would arise nearly as I have stated them, than that the sons and grandsons, of the first settlers, would be living in the full enjoyment of every prerogative of their ancestors. And may it not therefore be concluded, that an Utopian theory, contradictory, in fact, to the very nature of man, can never be a principle of government.

Having, I think, demonstrably proved that the Doctor's perfect free state is a perfect chimaera, I shall proceed to give a few of the outlines of the British constitution, from which I believe it will be found to be the constitution the nearest approaching to perfection of any on the face of the globe. The legislative body consists of about eight hundred members; of these about two hundred and forty are hereditary, and the others, namely, sixteen peers and five hundred fifty-eight commoners, lose their rights every seven years. Into the elective part, none but those who have the fortunes of gentlemen are admitted, which implies not only an independence, but such an education as may qualify the members to consult on public affairs,
and

and prevent their being swayed by the impudent harangues of factious demagogues, which were wont to work on the passions of the blacksmiths and cobblers of Athens and ancient Rome. These elected members or representatives may be natives, not only of Great Britain, but of Ireland, or of the Colonies; in short, of any part of the British empire. The power of electing representatives is in the hands of about 200,000 persons, resident in Britain, who are not the very lowest of the people, for they must either possess a freehold of forty shillings a year, or be free burgessees, or pot-wallopers in some corporation*. Though the powers of legislation stop

* In the Roman republic, the power of electing, and I may even say the power of legislation, descended to the very vagrants, which was one chief cause of the ruin of that republic. The *Capite censi*, or the *Turba forensis*, so called from their having no home but the porticoes of the Forum, and no note in the Censor's book but of their names, were of great consequence in the elections at Rome, in the corrupt times of the republic. They were the great bawlers for liberty, and were ever ready to enter into the service of a Cataline, a Marius, or a Cæsar. The following words give a most elegant description of them. "Qui assidue pro LIBERTATE pugnant, preter aerem lucemque nihil in Italia possidere, sed sine lare sine sede, eos imperatores hortantur, ut pro aris focisque pugnent; orbis terrarum Dominos verbo appellari, revera autem ne glebam terræ possidere." The voters in this class were in reality vagrants, who had Rome for their parish, and might sleep where they could find a shelter. These however had a share in government, when I think they rather stood in the light of evil doers, to whom government ought to have been a terror.

stop with these 200,000 persons, yet there is not a subject in the whole empire, either male or female, or even under age, who may not give a deliberative opinion upon affairs of government (abstaining however from libellous and calumnious misrepresentation,) I mean, by the *liberty* of the *press*, of which precious liberty Doctor Price does not say one word, though his incoherent paragraphs are so larded with the words Liberty and Slavery, and Slavery and Liberty, that I wonder the printer's stock of types was not exhausted in composing them. To do him justice indeed, we find two sentences in page 13, in favour of *Personal Liberty*, which stand like two ears of wheat in a field of tares. By the Liberty of the Press, which the British constitution allows of, women, I say, and even youths at school and at the university, may give their sentiments on public affairs; and of late some women have eminently distinguished themselves in that line, though perhaps they might be as useful to the public, by confining themselves to the exercise of their domestic talents. Should the acts of the supreme legislative body be disapproved of by the majority of the nation, resistance to those acts is lawful, upon which principle every act, in a manner, appeals to the majority of the subjects for their approbation;

terror. We may guess at the rank of these legislators from that of their leader Sedulius, who Cicero says, "*propter inopiam telli in foro pernoctavit*," which he jocosely adds, gave him an opportunity of early intelligence.

and

and receives its stamp of authority from their acquiescence, so they may be said all to give their consent. All colonies and corporations have free liberty to manage their private concerns by their own discretion, without any direct order from the executive power. No magistrate can imprison any man one hour without shewing a cause. No Peer can be tried in any criminal case but by the whole body of the peerage. No commoner can be tried for any crime but by a jury of twelve of his peers *.

If a state, possessing these privileges, is not a free state, I own I can have no idea of one; but such is the British state. That it may be improved and brought nearer to perfection, has been observed by many political writers, and I very readily allow; but I am persuaded my readers will agree, that Doctor Price's idea of improvement is a very false one, when he says, it is of no importance what the number of representatives in the legislative body be, provided they be chosen by the majority of the people †. Now, though I could wish the present number of electors, or constituents, were augmented, I would much rather see their number diminished three fourths, than that the number of members of the House of Commons should be diminished three fourths. And I am inclined to think my sentiment is just, as it appears agreeable to scrip-

* No Roman could be tried for his life but by an assembly representing the whole people.

† Page 8.

ture, which says, *that in the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom*. When I find scripture on one side, and Doctor Price on the other, I do not hesitate which side to take.

We come now to the consideration of the Doctor's second proposition, "That all taxes" are free gifts for public services," which I affirm is equally false with his speculative doctrine about the principles of civil government, above refuted. The obligatory nature of taxes has been explained in a pamphlet published two years ago *, where it is shewn, by arguments that appear to have the evidence of demonstration, that public taxes in the British state, from the Saxon times downwards, have never been *free gifts*, but *necessary duties*. For those who may not have seen the arguments in that pamphlet, I shall here subjoin the following reasoning and historical facts, which will serve to shew the Doctor's notions about taxes are as false and unconstitutional as his notions about Civil Liberty.

The Doctor, as well as Lord Chatham, Lord Camden, Governor Pownal, and thousands of others, has been misled into the popular error, that *public taxes* were free gifts, because *parliamentary grants* formerly were free gifts, which error having been so presumptuously averred by some people here, has been one of the chief

* The Rights of the British Legislature to tax the Colonies vindicated.

causes of involving our Colonies in misery and blood. It is to be hoped that those instigators have the feelings of men, and are sorry for what they have done. Governor Pownal, I think, gives reasons to conclude that he has altered his sentiments on that point.

A narrow inspection into the English history, shews plainly (what indeed our general historians take very little notice of) that the defence of the state has always been obligatory upon the subjects. During the times of the Saxons it was the *trinoda necessitas* of the repair of bridges, the repair of castles, and the military expedition; and in the Norman times it was feudal tenures, implying *debita servitia* on the part of the subject, besides which, the King possessed *jure coronæ*, or in right of his crown, independent of the gifts of Parliament, (which were then rare things, granted with frequent intermissions) a fifth-part of the lands of the kingdom; Dr. Henry says in some cases a third. Our Kings, happily for the nation, were bad managers of their independent revenues; the progress of civilization has now abolished all the Norman tenures, in so far as they regard taxation, and the *trinoda necessitas* of the Saxons is long gone into disuse, excepting only in the instance of *castle-guard*, which, I believe, still subsists in one or two places. If some Kings squandered the royal domains, others added to them, such as Edward III. in whose warlike reign they appear to be very considerable; for the Parliament in the fif-

E

tieth

tieth year of his reign declare, *that if the King's revenues had been rightly managed, he might long maintain his wars without any charge to the Commons.* Other Kings such as Edward IV. and Henry VII. instead of enlarging them, only resumed what had been *unconstitutionally* given away; I say unconstitutionally, for the royal domains were in those days called and accounted the SACRED PATRIMONY of the Kings. In the pamphlet above referred to, it is shewn from the most indisputable authority, that Edward IV. possessed an income in right of his crown, independent of Parliament, of what would be at present nearly equivalent to five millions a year, and for several years together he did not ask a single farthing of his Parliament, that is, the subjects paid no taxes resembling those of the present times, excepting the customs. Between the time of Henry VII. and the time of Charles I. those royal domains, which were once so considerable, were all ~~put~~ into the subjects hands, and become private property; and then the patriots of Charles's time very heroically did as good as tell the King, that he might live as a King, and defend the nation upon NOTHING. I say, did, *in a manner*, tell the King; for they could not help confessing that the crown, that is, the governing power, had a RIGHT to the *tenures by barony, grand serjeanty, knights service in capite, knights service, the profits of wardship, liveries, premier seisines, marriages, reliefs, fines for alienation, customs, wrecks, treasure trove, escheats,*

excheats, forfeitures, and many other casual profits. Therefore they concluded Parliament should give him nothing; for so little did they understand the nature of the constitution, or of a civil constitution in general, that they kept continually talking of *their affairs*, meaning the subjects affairs, as distinct from *his affairs*, that is, the King's affairs. The unhappy King not having the spirit to resume the royal patrimony, which would have raised a nest of hornets about him, and finding that the invention of gun-powder, and the practices of the age had introduced such essential alterations both in sea and land armaments, that the tenures by barony, knights-service, &c. which by many evasions were dwindled into nothing, left the kingdom in a manner defenseless, attempted an ILLEGAL ACT; and, in his regal or executive capacity, compelled the subjects to give their assistance to the state in an uncommon way, not justified by the constitution.

The convulsions that followed brought us the present happy constitution of liberty that we possess, in which the people, by their share in the legislative assembly, that is, by holding the purse and revenue of the nation, are become the judges when it is proper to call forth the strength of the state, either offensively or defensively; but it is now as it was in former times, whenever that strength or aid is called forth, the subject must obey at his peril. This, I say, is the capital difference betwixt our present constitution and

our old; for, since the Revolution, it would be as unconstitutional for our Kings to possess five millions a year in royal domains independent of Parliament, as it was formerly held to be unconstitutional; nay, even impious, to alienate those domains. It was one great object of the Parliaments of old, with what policy I need not say, to take all opportunities of enlarging those domains; but happily their endeavours were counteracted by the rapacity of the courtiers. The Parliament made a law in the reign of Richard the II. "that whatsoever cometh to the
 " King by judgment, escheat, forfeiture ward-
 " ship, or any other ways, shall not be given
 " away; and the procurer of any gift shall be
 " punished." The same law was renewed in the reign of his successor, with the addition of a penalty, "of double value to every mover or
 " procurer of every such grant:" and four years afterwards it was enacted, "that no peti-
 " tion *for any thing* should be delivered to the
 " King but in the presence of the council, who
 " might examine it, lest the King's wants might
 " light upon the Commons."

The change in our constitution does not alter the principle, that the governing power has a right to demand aid of the subjects, or that taxes are obligatory. The term *trinoda necessitas* in the Saxon period, certainly implied an *obligation*; and this in the Norman times was altered into *debita servitia*, which also implies an *obligation*. All this the people in former days knew full

fell well, without ever dreaming that they were
 slaves on that account, or that they had no pro-
 perty. It does not appear that Henry VI. gave
 any alarm, when, by a proclamation, he told
 his subjects, " that by the law he could compel
 " every man in the kingdom, and at his own
 " charge, to attend his service ; but that he
 " would then excuse them if every man would
 " pay him the expence of two days attendance."
 How clearly by our old constitution the distinc-
 tion was observed between the *debita servitia*, and
 the *subsidia*, or subsidies of Parliament, appears
 from a very curious suit in the Exchequer
 in the time of Edward III. The Prior of Co-
 ventry was then attached to answer to the King
de servitio octo feodorum militum, for the service
 of eight knights fees that had been concealed and
 suppressed since the time of Henry III. The
 Prior pleaded, that though the Exchequer rolls
 might shew the value of ten fees then paid ; yet
 he, as well as his predecessors, only held by two
 fees, and that the payment for eight more was
 only an occasional parliamentary grant in the
 time of Henry III. on account of making his
 son a knight, and three years after for the mar-
 riage of his sister to the Emperor Frederick.
 The words of the record are, " quoad hoc quod
 compertum est hic in rotulis, quod tempore dic-
 ti Regis Henrici tertii, computatum fuit de cer-
 tis pecuniæ summis de auxiliis eidem Regi Hen-
 rico ad filium suum militem faciendum, et foro-
 rem suam maritandam concessis, hoc ei non pre-
 judicat

judicat in hac parte. Dicit enim quod *auxilia illa* non fuerunt; nec cenferi possunt esse *servitia*; immo quædam *subsidia* per magnates et communitatem regni *spontanea* & mera voluntate Regi concessa." That is, and as to its being found here in the rolls, that in the time of King Henry III. a computation was made of certain sums of money granted as *aids* to the said King, for making his son a knight, and marrying his sister, this does not prejudice him on this point. For he affirms, that *those aids* were not, nor cannot be deemed to be the usual obligatory taxes, which every man is obliged to pay according to the quantity of land he possesses. On the contrary, they were only some *subsidies* granted to the King by the Lords and Commons of the kingdom spontaneously and as a mere free gift. Here we have the *obligatory public taxes* most plainly contrasted with the *parliamentary free gifts*. These parliamentary gifts in the reign of Edw. III. probably did not make a tenth-part of the *national supplies*, or as they were then constitutionally called, the *King's supplies*. For we find that King towards the end of his reign declaring to his Parliament, *that to all the ornaments, albeit the subject to their pains contributed, yet was the same far more infinite charge to the Prince*. In the reign of Charles I. the parliamentary gifts probably made a full half of the public taxes; and then it began to be forgot that the ruling power had ever had a right to more ample revenues of another kind, Lord Coke
himself

himself seeming to be at a loss what opinion to form about it. How this great change was effected we may give some guess from the Exchequer process above mentioned ; for I have reasons which I cannot now enlarge upon, for suspecting that the Prior's lawyer urged a false plea ; and if eight knights fees out of ten could be suppressed in about eighty years, we may well suppose there were numberless evasions in the space of three hundred years ; and that the tenures by barony, knights-service, and other sources of crown revenue, which the Parliament referred Charles I. to, were far from being so ample as they had been three or four centuries before. But the great cause of the alteration, was the loss of the vast royal domain, that was become private property* ; and was actually so much power

* We may form some conjecture in what manner the royal domain was dissipated, and was become in the reign of Charles I. altogether insufficient for the defence of the nation, and the support of the crown, from the following fact mentioned by Sir Robert Cotton, who in his posthumous works tells us, " that the ecclesiastical " tenths annually or often paid to the Pope in former " times, and at the Reformation vested in the crown by " an act of Henry VIII. were nevertheless, *in his time,* " got into the hands of the laity, *though no subsequent act* " *had discharged them.*"

Though the patriots in the times of James I. and Charles I. denied the King the power of *taking* ; they freely allowed him the full power of *giving away*. And yet by the constitution as it then stood, the King had no more right to give away the SACRED PATRIMONY of the crown, than he had to take a farthing from the subject by a mode not prescribed by the supreme legislature.

tumbled

tumbled out of the scale of prerogative authority into the scale of the people, who, before the ballance could be rightly trimmed again, quickly shewed that they did not know how to use the power they had got.

By the ancient British constitution then it is evident all the subjects were obliged by the fundamental law of the state to give their assistance in its defence in proportion to their property, *at the call of the crown*. By the modern British constitution the same obligation remains upon the subject, *at the call of the supreme legislature*. No privilege, no charter can give an exemption from this obligation, for in the Saxon times the charters express that the *trinoda necessitas nulli unquam relaxari potest*, the duty of defending the state can be forgiven to no man. Lawyers have decided, that a tenure granted in the words *absque aliquid inde reddendo*, still implied an obligation to national defence; and in the time of Henry VI. on a grant made in the words, *tenendum cy frankement come le Roy est en son corone*, to be held as freely as the King holds his crown, a decision was given that the patentee was not exempt from military service.

From these historical details, which I have arranged as concisely as I could, we may conclude that though parliamentary grants were formerly *free gifts* to our Kings *without account*, yet the taxes for public defence in the British state never were free gifts. And indeed by the law of reason they cannot; for common sense tells

tells us, that government, which is the protecting power, could not protect if every individual gave his assistance in perilous cases, only so far as he himself chose. Can any thing be more absurd, than that the subjects in a civil state should be bound by law in every thing relative to society, but should have no obligation upon them but their own free will in regard to the public defence of the state? If such a system exists any where upon this globe, I should have been glad that Doctor Price would have been so good as to name the country where it is to be found.

According to the improved modern constitution of the British state, parliamentary grants are no longer benevolencies or free gifts to the King, to be used as he pleases without account; but they are the public revenues of the state, ordained by an act of the legislature, all deliberations concerning them beginning in the assembly of the people. Hoping therefore that I have proved this in a satisfactory manner to my readers, I shall at present conclude my observations on this subject with the two following corollaries, which appear evident deductions from what has been said.

First, since the state has now no public revenues but those of Parliament, those revenues are of DUTY and NECESSITY, and the words *giving* and *granting* on the part of the subjects, and of *thanking* on the part of the executive power, are mere empty forms; and that a taxing law is of the nature of other laws, and ought

F

to

to assume that form of, BE IT ENACTED by the authority of the King, Lords, and Commons. It would be very inconclusive, and contrary to fact, to affirm that the present body-guard of the King of France are Scotchmen, because when their muster-roll is called, they answer to their names by the word *ambeer*. It would only be a proof that *forms* remain when *realities* are gone*.

Secondly, since our Kings are not now in a capacity to carry on wars, but by the assistance of Parliament, the prerogative belonging to the crown of declaring peace and war is a prerogative in *form* only, though formerly the great royal domain and revenue *jure coronæ* made it an effectual one. This independent revenue appears to have led our Princes into very idle schemes of

* This point, of the obligatory nature of taxes, has hitherto been but too little the object of discussion, either in print or in Parliament. Two years ago I ventured, in the face of universal prejudice, to give an illustration and proof of it, which brought from Governor Pownall an apology for the old hypothesis; but he has not chosen to reply to my answer. Our great popular orator, above ten years ago, talked near three hours about it, and about it, without bestowing a single paragraph of ratiocination upon it. Doctor Price, exclusive of the page he lays to the charge of Lord Shelburne, does not bestow ten lines upon it in the whole of his performance. Now, in fact, the American controversy entirely hinges upon it; for if taxes be free gifts, the rebels are in the right; but if taxes are nothing but the united aid of the state called into action at the will of the supreme legislature, then we may say of the claim of the rebels what Cicero said of Cæsar's invasion of his country, *causa illa causam non habet*; it is a cause without a cause.

ambition;

ambition; and made them have one interest, and their people another, so that the *King's affairs* and the *peoples affairs* were looked upon as different things, which seems to be the true origin of *whig* and *tory*, distinctions that have now no foundation. The Parliament of Ed. III. tell him that he might long have carried on his wars without any charge to the Commons; and Carew who wrote his survey in Queen Elizabeth's time, says in praise of the people of Foy in Cornwall, "during the warlike reigns of our
 " two valiant Edwards, the Foyens addicted
 " themselves to back *their Princes quarrel*, by
 " coping with the enemy at sea." So then it was not the nation's quarrel! most assuredly it was not, in more senses than one. By the present happy constitution the interests of the King and people are united, and all wars that the British nation engage in must now be national wars.

Having now finished my observations on the nature of taxation, I shall proceed to expose the fallacy of another proposition of the Doctor's in this second section, if, indeed, that can be called a proposition, which is so involved in the terms, that the meaning of it is rather to be guessed at than perceived. The Doctor tells us, "that
 " the account now given of the principles of
 " public liberty, and the nature of an equal
 " and free government, shews what judgment
 " we should form of that OMNIPOTENCE, which
 " it has been said, must belong to every go-
 " vernment as such. Great stress has been

“ laid on this; but most unreasonably.” I suspect he here means a censure of the truly constitutional principle of the declaratory act, that the King, Lords, and Commons, have a *right* to govern in all cases whatsoever, which, for several years past, has been a fine subject for seditious declamation, and been deemed by the ignorant an innovation in our constitution. If ill connected propositions and vague exclamations might pass for reasoning, the Doctor might rank among the strenuous opposers of the supremacy of the supreme power. But to shew him and them that the principle of the declaratory act is no novelty, I will give them the opinion of a very worthy and a very learned man upon it, I mean Sir Thomas Smith, who was Secretary and Privy Counsellor to Queen Elizabeth. His elegant and ample description of the power of Parliament is as follows: *In comitiis Parliamentariis posita est omnis augustæ absolutæque potestatis vis, quippe quemadmodum robur et virtus Angliæ dicuntur in acie residere. Parliamentaria comitia veteres leges jubent esse irritas, novas inducunt, presentibus juxta ac futuris modum constituunt, jura et possessiones hominum privatorum commutant, spurios natalibus restituunt, cultum divinum sanctionibus corroborant, pondera & mensuras variant, — incerti juris controversias dirimunt ubi nihil lege cautum fuit, censum agunt, capitationes et vectigalia indicunt, delictorum gratiam faciunt, afflictas et majorum sceleribus perditas familias erigunt, vitæ necisque potestatem in eos obtinent*

nent quos ad hujusmodi disquisitiones Princeps advocaverat, atque ut concludam breviter, quicquid in centuriatis comitiis aut in tribunitiis populus Romanus officere potuisset, id omne in comitiis Anglicanis tanquam in metu principem populumque representante commode transfigitur. Interesse enim in illo conventu omnes intelligimur cujuscunque amplitutinis status aut dignitatis, Princepsve aut plebs fuerit, sive per seipsum hoc fiat, sive per procuratorem, nam omnibus per æque gratum esse oportet quicquid ex senatus consulto Parlamentario profectum est.* For the sake of the English reader I shall give the translation of this passage : “ For as the strength
 “ and manhood of England are said to reside
 “ in her arrayed militia, even so all the power
 “ of imperial and absolute authority is placed
 “ in her parliamentary assemblies. The parliamentary assemblies repeal old laws and make
 “ new ones, they make regulations for future affairs as well as present, they change the
 “ rights and possessions of private men, they legitimate natural children, they make penal
 “ laws, in regard to divine worship, they vary weights and measures,—they decide disputed
 “ points of right, where the law has made no provision, they settle subsidies, they appoint
 “ poll-taxes and other taxes ; they make acts of grace and pardon for criminals ; they restore
 “ the blood of families whose ancestors have been attainted, they have the power of life and
 “ death, I mean those appointed by the Prince

* De Repub. & Admin. Anglor. Tho. Smith, l. ii. c. 2.

“ for

“ for such purposes; and, in a word, whatever
 “ the Roman people could do either in their cen-
 “ turiate or tribunitiate assemblies, all that is
 “ constitutionally done in the English Parlia-
 “ ment, as in an assembly representing Prince
 “ and people. For we are all understood to be
 “ present in that assembly, of whatever rank,
 “ state, or dignity, whether Prince or com-
 “ moner, either by himself or by a representa-
 “ tive; for whatever is enacted by Parliament
 “ ought to be agreeable to every one.”

This extract plainly shews us what were the
 thoughts of a very good judge of the power of
 Parliament in Queen Elizabeth's days, and that
 the opinion of its absolute authority is no novel-
 ty. Now let us examine this declaratory act by
 the rule of reason, and first let us consider the
 terms. It says the King, Lords, and Commons
 have authority to govern in all cases whatsoever;
 and as these are very unlimited terms, the a-
 busive interpretation of them has been most un-
 limited. But I appeal to every man of sense and
 candour, whether they mean any thing more
 than that the Parliament has the same authority
 in the colonies as in Great Britain, or the colo-
 nists have the same right to the protection of
 Parliament (to which they have often applied)
 as the inhabitants of Great Britain. Do we in
 this island rest uneasily in our beds because we
 know the Parliament has a right to govern us
 in all cases whatsoever? Do we expect to be en-
 joined at what hour we shall rise in the morn-
 ing,

ing, how many glasses of wine we may drink after dinner, how many cabbages we may plant in our garden, how often we shall wash our hands? Nothing but the most captious spirit of sedition could draw any such inferences from the expression, which only means that the supreme power of the state can admit of no other power to controul its operations relative to the well-being of the society over which it presides.

But the Doctor seems to think, for I own in pages 15 and 16, I can hardly discover his meaning, he so writes about and about his subject; I say he seems to think, that this claim in rulers *degrades mankind into a body of vassals descending like cattle from one set of owners to another, who have an absolute dominion over them.* If that be his opinion, I will venture to say, He errs, not knowing the scriptures, nor the constitution of his country. Scripture makes a very wide difference between government and absolute dominion. I have before given the scripture count of government, which is an authority to suppress vice and promote virtue. I shall now explain what it says of absolute dominion. After the flood we are told, that God gave to man absolute dominion over the beasts of the earth, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea; the plain meaning of which is, I give you full authority, at your pleasure, to deprive any of them of breath and life, just as freely as I deprive any of you of life at my pleasure. What excellent logicians must those men be, who con-

clud

e

I

clude, that any form of government on earth invests rulers with the same authority over men ; and how well qualified they are for becoming members of the African company ! I rather think that most governments, even the freest, assume too great authority over the life of man, and that a great reformation in that respect is wanted in the laws of Great Britain. The distinction that Scripture makes between government and absolute dominion is very conspicuous, and ought ever to be had in remembrance ; and yet how cunningly, or how ignorantly have they often been confounded by seditious writers*.

Having

* It is with regret I observe a man of abilities wandering after the false light of Dr. Price, I mean the author of a Sermon, preached at Cambridge on the 29th of May, 1776 ; in which discourse are several very absurd and erroneous propositions, intermixed with much good sense and natural eloquence. " By the great charter," he says ; " under which man claims dominion over the " other animals of the earth, God did not give any one " man dominion over another." Who doubts that ? But what has the government of men over beasts to do with the government of men over men ? Had the Rev. Professor but well considered his own text, he might have seen clearly, that the government of men means no more than, *the force of society united in protecting the virtuous, and punishing the vicious*, as I have already explained it.

I am astonished that any man of discernment could advance the two following propositions, which the experience even of children is sufficient to disprove. " We are all born into the world with the same natural " advantages"—" The equal distribution of natural " good is accompanied with an equality of natural facul-
" ties."

Having shewn that government, according to Scripture, by no means implies absolute domi-

"ties." Notwithstanding these assertions in page 2; the author, in page 3, allows of some "natural inequality—which, nevertheless, among free agents, does not induce any natural inequality."

The latter part of this sermon is only an amplification of the trite maxim, that if this nation is ever undone, it must be by a Parliament; but towards the conclusion the author again deviates into an unconstitutional sentiment, when assuming the character of apologist for the factious, he says, they may alledge, "that the only difference between the resistance of the people in the time of Charles I. and the present resistance in America is, that in the former period, it was a part of the nation that then resisted the King, because he would have taken from them their property without their consent, given by themselves or their representatives; and now it is a part of the empire, which resists the legislature for the same reason." According to this sophism, there is no difference between a collector of the land-tax and a house-breaker; for they both knock at your door, they both take your money from you, and they both take it without your consent: for few house-keepers, I believe, would pay the land-tax or any other tax, *if they could help it*; but they know that resisting the legislature, in a *lawful act*, would not only be a want of duty, but would be very perilous to themselves. That it is a *lawful act* of the legislature; nay, that it is its *inherent right* to DEMAND taxes from all the subjects, has before been clearly demonstrated from page 24 to 33 and also in *the Right of the British Legislature vindicated, second edition*. The idea of taxes being free gifts of the individual is as much an unconstitutional idea, as it would be ungeographical to affirm, that there are no antipodes. Great names have erred in both; but those who have a higher regard for truth, than for the authority of great names, will hardly, I think, any longer maintain the former idea.

nion, I shall now submit it to my readers, whether the Doctor, by his manner of arguing against the declaratory act, does not prove himself ignorant of the constitution. *Nothing, he says, (page 15,) can be more absurd than the doctrine some have taught with respect to the omnipotence of Parliaments.* Here, according to his usual vague style, the doctrine which some have taught, and which he is combating, is not expressed, nor indeed is it once any where expressed in the three or four pages where he seems to treat about it: He goes on, *Parliaments possess no power beyond the limits of the trust, for the execution of which they were formed.* Who doubts that? Again, *if omnipotence can with any sense be ascribed to a legislature, it must be lodged where all legislative authority originates, that is, in the people.* Agreed; perfectly agreed. But what does all this say against the principle of the declaratory act? It all tends to confirm it; for what is a legislative act by the British constitution, but an act of the people? It has before been shewn to be a fundamental law in our constitution, that whenever the majority of the people disapprove of an act of Parliament, resistance is lawful, and a revolution of government may ensue; but the acquiescence of the majority gives a full authority to the legislative act to bind the whole community in civil matters. Because the majority of a society, consisting of many millions of people, have a right to resist, is it either good logic or true constitutional language to say, that the minority,

nority, should they be a million, or two millions,
 have a right to do the same? such sophistry will
 not pass even upon the authority of Mr. Pitt.
 When he in a raving fit presumed to say, that
 he was glad the Bostonians had resisted, he
 shewed himself ignorant of the constitution, he
 deserved the censure of the assembly before whom
 he spoke, and ought not to have been suffered
 to proceed without asking their pardon. We
 have lately seen a young Lord of great fire, of
 genius, and vigour of mind, give a most spirit-
 ed check to such unconstitutional language in a
 Duke of Richmond and a Lord Camden, which
 is a proceeding that does him great honour; for
 certainly liberty of debate has its bounds, as well
 as liberty of action. By the principles of the
 British constitution, *res Britanniae nolunt male ad-*
ministrari, the Parliament have no right to alter
 fundamental laws without the acquiescence of
 the people; but that they have altered them
 with that acquiescence is most certain, witness
 the septennial act, witness the sixteen clauses of
 Magna Charta that have been repealed; witness
 the act of lessening the number of constituents in
 the time of Henry VI. and others that might be
 mentioned. The British legislature then in as-
 suming to itself an omnipotence, as Dr. Price is
 pleased to term it, always supposes the acquies-
 cence of the majority of the people; for we all
 know our Parliament stands every moment ac-
 countable to the nation; but never to the mino-
 rity. Therefore it is downright folly and rebel-

lion in the Pensylvanian Farmer, to give it as the principle upon which he and his associates act, *nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*, we will not have the laws of England altered, when the supreme legislature, in making a new law with the acquiescence of the nation, declare *we will have the laws of England altered*. Dr. Price, then from his little sally against the declaratory act, appears to me to be an advocate of rebellion; I will not say designedly, but from his ignorance of the nature of our constitution. And I think the terms of the act itself, when rightly understood, can give no offence to any British subject in any part of the empire; for I defy all the apologists of the rebels, to give one instance of any civil government on earth, that does not act up to the spirit of it.

Dr. Price towards the end of this section quits argument, and falls into declamation, of which the following specimen is, I think, worth the readers' perusal. "Many a sycophant of power
 " have the people of this kingdom sacrificed.
 " Often have they fought and bled in the cause
 " of liberty. But that time seems to be going."
 I hope it is gone for ever; for when liberty is perfectly secure it would be downright madness to be fighting and bleeding for her, of which I doubt not the colonists will soon be convinced. He proceeds: "The fair inheritance of liberty
 " left us by our ancestors, many of us are not
 " willing to resign. An abandoned venality,
 " the inseparable companion of dissipation and
 " extravagance,

“ extravagance, has poisoned the springs of pub-
 “ lic virtue among us: and should any events
 “ ever arise that should render the same opposi-
 “ tion necessary that took place in the times of
 “ King Charles I. and James II. I am afraid all
 “ that is valuable to us would be lost. The
 “ terror of the standing army, the danger of
 “ the public funds, and the all-corrupting in-
 “ fluence of the treasury, would deaden all
 “ zeal, and produce general acquiescence and
 “ servility.” This, in my apprehension, is
 precisely what is called writing for the alehouses;
 and it is with regret I observe, that too much of
 Dr. Price’s pamphlet is of this stamp; but I
 hope I shall not be obliged to expose any more
 of it, and that my readers are satisfied with the
 present specimen,

We come now to the Doctor’s third section;
 which is entitled, *Of the Authority of one Country
 over another*. I must begin my refutation of
 the unconstitutional reasoning in this section by
 some remarks upon the title; and in shewing the
 absurdity or rather the sophistry of that title, I,
 in a manner, refute the whole section. The
 word *country* in the English language, in a direct
 sense is nearly equivalent to the word *territory*,
 and has a very great latitude of signification.
Country, in the Highlands of Scotland, means
 a narrow glen separated from another glen by an
 intervening mountain; in the language of our
 peasants it means a district extending about a
 day’s

day's journey round their habitations; and in this sense the British government extends over a thousand countries. Geographers carry it farther, and portion out the earth into large tracts distinguished by very particular boundaries; but politicians, without regarding the distinctions of geographers, mean by *country* all territory (however geographically divided) under the same domination. Thus Portugal is called a country, though in the geographical division it makes but a part of Spain. The two Sicilies are called a country, though they consist of a part of Italy in conjunction of government with the island of Sicily. The Russian empire is reckoned one country, though part of it lies in Europe, and by far the greatest part of it in Asia. By the *country* of *Turkey* every merchant understands a country under the dominion of the Grand Signior, lying part in Europe, part in Asia, and part in Africa; and *country* when applied to the British state means a territory, part in Europe, and part in the other three quarters of the globe.

Therefore the expression, *of the authority of one country over another*, either in the direct geographical or direct political sense of the word *country*, is an expression next a-kin to nonsense, and has a very obscure meaning. Does the Doctor take the word *country* in a metaphorical sense for *the people of a country*? I wonder such an accurate reasoner as he wishes to be thought, could be guilty of such an oversight; and then
I say

I say of his whole third section *quid ad nos*, what at all has the whole of it to do with the revolt of colonies against the government of the state of which they are members?

Is an inhabitant of Great Britain and Ireland a foreigner in the British colonies in North America; or is a native of those colonies a foreigner in Great Britain and Ireland? Was Mr. Trecothick, or was Mr. Huske, made a British subject by a bill of naturalization? Or has Mr. Cruger ever been naturalized? No; both he and they, from their birth, were entitled to all the noble privileges of British subjects, because they were born within the British dominions. Are not the natives of Britain and the natives of the British colonies *fellow-subjects*; and among fellow-subjects, that some should be rulers and others ruled, we have seen is in the very essence of government, and is the actual state of every free civil society on earth. That one society can have but one centre of legislative union is also equally evident. Whoever is convinced of these truths will most plainly perceive the pitiful sophistry that runs through the whole of this section under the false presumption, that Great Britain is one political country, and her American colonies another. How mighty easy it is to draw seditious consequences from false premises! The Doctor's premises being incontrovertibly false, all that he says about *one country* and *another country*, has no more relation to Great Britain and her colonies than to *Persia* and *China*.

After

After some very general and trifling reflections on his own premises, the Doctor employs page 21, and the three following, in giving an erroneous representation of the progression from peaceable government to anarchy in Massachusetts Bay, the various steps of which progression are, according to him, all owing to misgovernment at home. Now I will venture to say, that they are owing, in a much greater degree, to the operation of seditious and rebellious principles in the colony. Our government, however it may lay claim to *omnipotence*, according to Dr. Price's phrase, never yet laid claim to *infallibility*; for there hardly ever passes a session of Parliament without some acts being *amended*. Therefore every one acknowledges that grievances may flow from acts of Parliament; but it is Parliament alone that can redress those grievances; and it is a rule in every government, *woe to those subjects that take upon them to redress their own grievances*. The people of Massachusetts Bay, when they found themselves aggrieved, ought to have petitioned the supreme legislature; but, to the best of my remembrance, there is no instance of any petition from them to Parliament for these ten years past. The last petition, I think, was for the repeal of the stamp act, and the prayer of the petition was granted. Instead of applying to this true source and fountain of healing-waters, for their political concerns, they have, in the stubbornness of their hearts, hewn out to themselves broken cisterns that can hold

no

no water. They have taken it into their heads to be stout-hearted, and forgetting that they were British subjects, have dared to make a hostile resistance to acts of the supreme legislature, from which proceeding they now feel very melancholy consequences. For the continuance of those melancholy effects they must entirely blame themselves; for they may bring back their usual sun-shine, whenever they please——*to be obedient.*

The Doctor proceeds, “it may be asked,—
“Are there not causes by which one state may
“acquire a *rightful* authority over another,
“though not consolidated by an adequate representation? I answer that there are no such
“causes.” Such is the Doctor’s answer to his own question. But I answer, there was not the least need of making such an absurd question; for the reasoning about the authority of the supreme British legislature over the colonies has nothing at all to do with the authority of one state over another, as the British colonies are not *states* but parts of the British state. The Doctor might just as well give us a long dissertation about the properties of a triangle, when the question was about the properties of a circle; or favour the world with a demonstration, that a circle may have two centres.

Though the Doctor’s question has nothing at all to do with the sovereignty of the British legislature over all the British dominions; yet as he has, in his own answers to it, presumed to ad-

H

vance

vance principles not only diametrically opposite to scripture but to common sense ; and has laid them down with such a dictatorial air as may mislead weak minds into sedition and rebellion, I beg my readers indulgence while I expose the absurdity and diabolical tendency of his reasoning on this point. Neither *conquests*, nor *compact*, nor *obligations conferred*, he says, can give any rightful authority to one state over another. As to conquest in a just war, that in his opinion gives only a right to indemnification, and a reasonable security against future injury. Now let us suppose that the conquering nation can see no *reasonable security* against future injury, but in maintaining an immediate rule over the conquered, according to the Doctor they have a full right to this *rule* ; so very inconsistent is he with himself, and so very inconsistent must false doctrines ever be with truth.

When a conquering nation assumes the rule of a subdued nation, it says, in fact, I will not exterminate you ; but I have found you so very malicious, that for the future I will take upon me to be the punisher of evil-doers, and the rewarder of the virtuous among you, as I find in so doing, I violate no law human or divine. While this continues to be the spirit of the ruling nation, the scripture recommends the sword to be sheathed, and that the ruled should obey. But Dr. Price cannot distinguish such obedience from slavery, and an extinction of inalienable rights of human nature, which are according to him

him *legislating for one's self*, and giving to the ruling power, only what share of one's property one thinks fit. Now it has been already shewn, that the natural inequality of mankind is a most evident demonstration, that such rights are not among the inalienable rights of man. Therefore, since the Doctor's premises are again found to be false, his consequence must also be false; and indeed we find it expressly condemned by our Saviour, who, when the Pharisees asked him if it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar, told them that they ought to pay it. Our Saviour's reply to the seditious Pharisees plainly admits of the following interpretation. "I perceive what mischief you have in your hearts, from the ensnaring and seditious nature of your question; but do not imagine that your evil purposes shall have any countenance from me. This country of Judæa forms at present a province of the Roman empire. I do not enquire how or when it became such. But by the power of that state every man among you is protected, and his property secured; therefore it is your duty to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; that is, to yield a peaceable submission to magistracy, and to support the protecting power in protecting you; and it is your duty to yield that support with a spirit of meekness and peace; for to that the governing power has a full and just right. I do not here preach up *passive obedience* to you, for I acknowledge

“ you have rights that are inalienable to
 “ you as men, and that Cæsar can have no
 “ power over. But those *rights* you remain
 “ in full possession of. Are not we allowed
 “ to worship in this temple? Have not I
 “ read the Scriptures to you, and exhorted you
 “ in the synagogue? Is not our Sanhedrim still
 “ a court of justice; and are not the laws of
 “ Moses the laws of the land? Therefore I ex-
 “ hort you to avoid seditious practices; pay that
 “ support to government which justice requires
 “ of you, make it your chief study to regulate
 “ your own conduct, and do not waste your
 “ time in political questions, which have a ten-
 “ dency to foster a spirit of discontent and sedi-
 “ tion.” Had Doctor Price ranged himself a-
 mong those Pharisees, he would have received
 the same reproof from our Saviour*.

In short, the sum of the Doctor's reasoning
 about the right to govern from *conquest*, *compact*,
 or *obligation conferred*, is all comprehended in
 the following proposition, that no rule, or no
 mode of subjection is rightful and lawful but
 that founded upon laws made by one's own con-
 sent. This proposition he vainly imagines is a
 truth deducible from man's inalienable rights,
 which inalienable rights, when specified, are de-

* We have seen the Quakers, in their last truly Scrip-
 tural annual letter to their brethren, following our Sa-
 viour's example, and giving the same rebuke to the se-
 ditious zealots of the present age.

monstrably

monstrably found not to belong to man. If this is not a baseless fabrick, I know not what is; and yet, however foundationless it be, the seditious all run in, to shelter themselves in it.

The Doctor again condescends to be pitifully absurd; and asks, "How much has been done by this kingdom for *Hanover*? But no one will say, that on this account we have a right to make the laws of *Hanover*; or even to draw a single penny from it without its own consent." So then, when I give an apple out of my orchard to a farmer's boy, he stands on the same footing of obedience and allegiance as my own son! Did Great Britain give the territory of *Hanover* to the *Hanoverians*, on condition of their obeying the laws of the British legislature? Does the Doctor ever remember any *Hanoverian* sitting in the British Parliament? Has a *Hanoverian* a right to the privileges of a British subject, without being naturalized by act of Parliament? Even then he can neither elect nor be elected. The Doctor, in answering my questions, will find a solution of his own. The colonists may well be called the sons of Great Britain; for there are thousands and ten thousands in the colonies, fathers and mothers of numerous families, who, if it had not been for lands bestowed upon them by Britain, would have been old bachelors and old maids. Above a million of subjects in the colonies owe their very existence in this world, under God, to the bounty of the British government.

Dr. Price

Dr. Price opens the *Second Part* of his performance with the following paragraph. " In the foregoing disquisitions, I have, from one leading principle, deduced a number of consequences, that seem to be incapable of being disputed. I have meant that they should be applied to the great question between this kingdom and the colonies, which has occasioned the present war with them." Now I hope I have already demonstrated to the unprejudiced reader, that this leading principle is altogether a false principle, taken up by the Doctor from his not distinguishing the alienable from the inalienable rights of human nature; and from his confounding *legal government* with *absolute dominion*, that is, the government of man over man, with the government of man over beasts.

His leading principle upon which he has founded his seditious reasoning, proving a falsehood, I might here stop all farther examination of his absurd opinions, about the political subordination of colonies to the supreme legislature of the state, of which they are members; for in fact the substance of his pamphlet is already answered. But though the Doctor's *baseless fabric* is now demolished, I hope for my reader's indulgence, while I attempt to beat the ruins to pieces, by refuting in detail his bold averments, which seem to proceed from a triple source, from vulgar prejudices, partial reading, and ignorance
of

of history. Hear first some of his alehouse prejudices. "We have been used," he says, "to speak of the colonies as *our* colonies, and to think of them as in a state of subordination to us, and as holding their existence in America only for our use.—The meanest person among us is disposed to look upon himself as having a body of subjects in America, and to be offended at the denial of his right to make laws for them." If the Doctor had not affirmed this, I should not have thought it possible for the meanest person in this kingdom, to have talked such absurd language. He puts *our* in Italic; but for what reason he himself best knows; for we say *our King* as well as *our colonies*. That the colonies are in a state of subordination to the supreme legislature of the empire, is a most constitutional truth; but it is a mere abuse of terms to conclude, that the individuals in the colonies, or the colonists collectively, are in subordination to the individuals of Great Britain. It serves an excellent seditious purpose to insinuate such a thing; but the meanest person in the colonies, if he uses his own understanding, will perceive that he is no more subordinate to the highest subject in Britain, than if he lived in Britain.

Next follows a proof of the Doctor's ignorance of history. "The case of a free country branching itself out in the manner Britain has done, and sending to a distant world colonies, which have there, from small beginnings,

“ beginnings, and under free legislatures of their own, increased,—is a case, which is new in the history of mankind.” It is new to those who are unacquainted with history; but the Romans, in the time of the republic, planted a colony at Carthage, another at Narbonne, where the magnificent ruins shew it to have been extremely opulent: two others in Corsica, some in Illyricum, some in Spain, all of which had an internal form of free government by duumvirs, senate, and people, resembling that of Rome. The Romans also had no less than ten colonies in this island of Britain, with powers of self-government. These last indeed were planted by the emperors, and not by the free republic; but had they been planted by the republic, the Roman history shews, that they could not constitutionally have disobeyed a law from Rome.

The Doctor begins his first section of this *Second Part* with another attack upon the Declaratory Act, the words of which, he says, in fact declare, “ that this kingdom has a right to do with the colonies what it pleases.” Here we have another proof of the Doctor’s confounding *government* with *absolute dominion*. I have already explained the constitutional meaning of the Declaratory Act; but as the occasion offers, I shall present my readers with a little more of our author’s sophistry on that subject, which appears to be only a repetition of that of the Pennsylvania-
vanian

vanian Farmer, nearly in the very words. " If
 " the Declaratory Act means any thing, it
 " means, he says, that the property, and the
 " legislations of the colonies are subject to the
 " absolute discretion of Great Britain, and ought
 " of right to be so." Any reader acquainted
 with the English constitution will, upon the least
 reflection, perceive that it means no such thing.
 The Doctor ought to have added, *for the best
 well being of the whole community, of which the
 supreme legislature is the fittest judge*; and then
 he would have given the true import of the De-
 claratory Act. " If any part of the property of
 " the colonists, he says, is subject to the dis-
 " cretion of the British legislature, *the whole*
 " must be so, which it is evident leaves them
 " nothing they can call their own." This is
 precisely a repetition of the sophism of Mr.
 Locke, which was clearly refuted and shewn to
 be altogether an illogical proposition, two years
 ago, in the *Right of the British Legislature to tax
 the American Colonies vindicated*; but the Doc-
 tor's partial reading has probably been the occa-
 sion of his bringing it again into view. What
 would any plain man think of Dr. Price, should
 he affirm, *If the sun shines upon a part of St.
 Paul's church, it must therefore shine upon the whole
 church*; or *if the Thames rises one foot in Westmin-
 ster-hall, it must therefore rise to the top of the
 roof*. Few men have a greater veneration for
 the memory of Mr. Locke than myself, but
 that will not make me adhere to him against
 I truth.

truth. *Amicus Plato; sed magis amica veritas.* Here Mr. Locke has evidently nodded, and drawn a consequence directly against the logical maxim, *a particulari ad universale non valet consequentia*; that is, whoever concludes generally from a particular affirmation, reasons falsely. The Doctor puzzles himself about the no-limitation of the authority of Parliament, and concludes, that it has no limits, because those limits have by the constitution wisely never been fixed. According to him the Parliament may grasp and pillage at pleasure, *for its claim admits of no limitation.* But I affirm the Parliament has not a right to a half-penny of the subjects money, unless as FIDUCIARY or trustee for the public. As trustee or sovereign superintendant of the welfare of the whole community, it has a right to, *I don't know how much*, from every subject of the empire; and none but itself is the judge of that *how much*; but to conclude from thence, that it would leave the subjects no property, or nothing that *they can call their own*, is not more illogical than it is seditious. Twenty Mr. Lockes will not alter the nature of truth. In fact no state on earth, that I have any knowledge of, has such a sacred regard for private property as the British state, witness our winding roads and irregular streets. But taxes for national defence are public property, and as the seditious endeavour to raise the cry, that Parliament may swallow up all, I will in a few words mention what lengths

lengths it has gone, that we may form some conjecture of the future. This nation probably never made greater exertions than during the late war. About fourteen years ago I demonstrated to the public, that in the last year of Mr. Pitt's administration, the expence of government was 26 millions sterling, or a million every fortnight, that is, we raised about 12, we borrowed 12, and run in arrears about 2 millions. Now what proportion does that bear to the income of the nation? That income may be easily demonstrated to be above 110 millions; therefore this expence of government was not quite five shillings in the pound on the whole income; but still it was a most dreadful situation for the nation, that made peace in the highest degree necessary. I know but one state that has exceeded us, I mean the Genoese, who, when they repulsed the Austrians in the war before last, probably did it at the expence of ten shillings in the pound of their incomes; but I suppose they thought it well bestowed, though it was what they could not have long endured. For in a garrison it is thought an intolerable duty, for the men to be but one night in bed out of two. Consequently we may well imagine, that such a civil situation, including women and children, would soon lead to ruin. But leaving future wars to future contingencies, I shall consider our present peace establishment, civil list, and public debt included, which amounts to 11 millions; and this compared to the national income of

110 millions is but one-tenth part, or but two shillings in the pound.

Now suppose the supreme legislature should ask of the colonies on the Continent of North America 500,000*l.* what proportion would that bear to their income? The income of those colonies may be demonstrated to the above 12 millions a year, consequently 500,000*l.* paid in public taxes would only be a twenty-fourth part, or ten pence in the pound. Such is the probable state of parliamentary taxation for the colonies in America; but Dr. Price raises it up to an impossible state, upon as sound reasoning as if he had alledged, the Thames might rise to the top of Westminster-hall because it has been lately found to rise a foot in it. Now what becomes of the Doctor's fine question; "what is it that can give to any people such a supremacy over another people, as to leave them nothing that they can call their own?" Here we have the Doctor again falling into the mistake of making the British subjects different people. But passing over all that, the principles of the British constitution, when rightly comprehended, plainly shew, that the question could only be made by a person that does not understand those principles, and that the question itself has no relation to that constitution. The same reflection is equally applicable to all the seditious reasoning in the answers which the Dr. gives to his own question. It would therefore be wasting my readers time to enter into a minute examination

mination of every sophism, which the Doctor founds upon this absurd question. Only I cannot help observing, that in page 36 he appears to me not only nonsensical but irreligious, when he says, "if in order to preserve its unity (the "unity of the British empire) one half of it must "be enslaved to the other half, let it, in the "name of God, want unity." A drunken drayman in the street could hardly use the name of the Supreme Being with greater levity than our author appears here to have done; and it will not injure his reasoning in the least, to have that phrase altered in any future edition. We all know, that though in the British state, as in every other free state on earth, subjects assist to govern subjects, yet there is no law of slavery in all its code.

In the following page the Doctor gives us another proof of his ignorance of history. "The "English, he says, came from Germany. Does "that give the German states a right to tax us?" How pitiful is this! History shews us, that the Saxons, who settled in Britain, did not receive their protection nor their modes of government from Germany; and I suspect a British Saxon could not in Saxony have claimed all the rights of a native. The Doctor's arguments really crumble to pieces in the very handling.

Another example we have of this in his most illogical comparison between a parent state and its colonies, with a natural parent and his issue. His comparison halts in every particular. In the
first

first place were it true, that a certain period frees dependent states from the laws of the parent state, the colonies, even according to the Doctor's system, are not arrived at that period. With man, it is about the fourth part of his natural life; but can the Doctor fix the term of the natural life of a state? The British state has existed 1300 years, and the revolted colonies one with another, not much above one hundred years. The American colonies are certainly the political children of Great Britain, and the Doctor wisely concludes, that some of them have shewn themselves not to be her political children by their revolt; whereas he ought only to have concluded, that they are disobedient children, and have deserved chastisement as such.

He graciously allows, that the territory of the colonists belongs to Great Britain; but he asks, "did they not settle upon it under the
 " faith of charters, which promised them the
 " enjoyment of all the rights of English-
 " men, and allowed them to tax themselves,
 " and to be governed by legislatures of their
 " own, similar to ours?" The terms of this question are so general and involved as to give it a very ambiguous meaning. Taking it in the large sense which the Doctor's words seem to imply, I affirm it is not in the power of any King to grant such charters as bestow upon communities all the rights of Englishmen; for in that sense colonies would be independent states, who might declare war against each other, or
 against

against any other states; in short, acting *sui juris*, and minding each their own interests, exclusively of any other, without any superintending controul. But taking the charters in their true meaning of implying a subordination to the sovereign legislature, which, till the present factious period, was the universal acceptance; I say, that it has before been evidently proved, by examples in the English history, both before and since the Conquest; *that no charters can exempt from public taxes*, though they should even specify such exemption in express words, : see before in page 32) and it has also been proved, that by the British constitution public taxes are no voluntary contributions or free gifts to be determined at the will of the giver.

The Doctor, in page 43, enters upon a most sagacious enquiry, and asks, "Whether, if we
 " have now the supremacy over the colonies,
 " we shall not be equally entitled to it in any
 " future time?" I answer most assuredly we shall, while the majority of the state agree to it. He goes on. "They are now but little short of
 " half our number. To this number they have
 " grown from a small body of original settlers,
 " by a very rapid increase. The probability is,
 " that they will go on to increase; and that in
 " 50 or 60 years, they will be *double* our number and form a mighty empire, &c.—In that
 " period will they be still bound to acknowledge
 " that supremacy over them which we now
 " claim?"

“ claim ?” I answer, most assuredly they will, while the majority of the state agree to it.

Before I expose the weakness of the Doctor's Herculean argument, I will make two observations ; first, *if the colonists are now but little short of half our number*, why do not they pay near half our taxes ? I have moderately placed their quota at 500,000 pounds, or ten pence in the pound of their general income ; but Dr. Price gives reasons to think they can well afford to pay a great deal more. My second observation is, that I believe, whoever computes their future increase, from their past increase, will be greatly out in his reckoning for many reasons ; first, as manufactures increase among them, country settlements, which are the great nurseries of children, will not be so frequent among them ; next, when their woods are diminished, their sources of opulence will diminish ; for while timber finds a good market, it may, in a manner, be considered as a crop of 200 years standing, reaped at one cutting. Again, as their cities increase, their luxuries will increase, and a preference to a town life will get the better of the natural inclination to leave issue, which will of course lessen the usual proportion of births. All this appears to me the natural course of things ; and, whatever some speculative calculators may think, I suspect the increase of population in the colonies will be found to proceed in the same proportion as the decrease of water running out from a cask by a hole near the bottom.

tom. The more the colonies increase, the more difficult they will find it to increase; and whatever may be our wishes for the augmentation of their population, that which is most natural is always most probable.

Let us now examine the flimsiness of the Doctor's reasoning, and see how he has bewildered himself in his sagacious enquiry. The conclusions to be drawn from the following practical case will illustrate both. Three or four centuries hence, let us suppose the population of the British state may amount to 45 millions, namely, 15 millions in Europe, and 30 millions in America. By the territory in Europe, I mean Britain and Ireland; and I suppose the 30 millions in America, distributed in the following manner, 28 colonies on the Continent of a million of inhabitants each, a confederated nation like Ireland of one million, which I shall suppose to consist of the five Indian tribes, whom I could wish to see christianized and civilized, rather than extirminated and rapaciously robbed of their territory. The remaining million of British subjects I place in the sugar islands. I shall suppose all these subjects living in harmony and peace, with a most powerful force for self-defence at the direction of a supreme legislature, resident somewhere, suppose in Great Britain. At length some seditious spirits, in one of the colonies, like the Pharisees in the time of our Saviour, discover that the members have no relation with the head, and, assisted by some Dr.

K

Price,

Price, instigate as many of their fellow-subjects as they can to a revolt, by dinning into their ears the words *liberty* and *slavery*, the meaning of which they take care to misrepresent, - and by reminding them of the glorious association of 13 colonies in the year 1775. The sober-minded, on the other hand, say, when one is in health, it is madness to be taking physic; your representation of liberty and slavery is calumnious and false; will this intended revolt better our condition? the history of the eighteenth century shews us, that the one factious colony got twelve others who misapprehended their own privileges, to dance to their pipe, yet they all paid so dear for the music, that even their children suffered for their folly. Let us suppose that these prudent remonstrances had no effect, and that ten, or twelve, or even fifteen millions were mad enough to have recourse to arms; yet what would their strength be against the remaining thirty millions, who disapproved of their project? That all the colonies would not be of one mind *then*, may justly be presumed from their not being all of one mind *now*; for, independent of the well-affected scattered in the revolted colonies, we have the very honourable example of one entire colony on the Continent directly disapproving of the rebellious sentiments of others now in arms, for they do not know what. This difference of sentiments among the different colonies may be presumed from another reason. The revolters, with the Doctor's project of *forming a mighty empire*

pire, could not dissemble, but the new empire must have a head ; the colonies, therefore, where this head was not to be fixed, would still remain members, and consequently the connection of many of them, with the usual seat of government, might have such a strong influence upon them as to make them rival and contemn the new seat of government. Again, such a revolution could not happen without great numbers of people of rank and fortune seeing themselves over-topped by persons who had been their inferiors, and it may therefore be presumed, that those people would exert themselves to maintain the established government, in order thereby to maintain their usual rank and influence. From all these reasons we may conclude, that the British state may continue without being dismembered for ages to come, with as much virtue in Great Britain three hundred years hence as now, notwithstanding all the Doctor's gloomy *mays* and *may not's*.

What extent empires may have to the best well-being of the subjects that compose them, is a problem, the solution of which exceeds Dr. Price's abilities or mine ; and it is a problem which I suspect will never be resolved. The Otaheitiens, I suppose, imagine no ship can be built larger than Capt. Cooke's frigate ; but we know by experience that vessels may be constructed four times as large ; and there we stop. Archimides, however, from his own experience, could have assured us that vessels might be built four times as large as our first-rates ; but how much

larger is still a question ; for what is the utmost strength and size that scantlings and frame-work will admit of, has never yet been ascertained. It is with empires as with ships of war ; whenever there is not strength to keep the pieces together, they must fall asunder.

In the second ^{section} ~~edition~~ of the Second Part, the Doctor professes to treat of the question, *whether the war with America is justified by the principles of the constitution* ; but what I have above said answers this completely ; for it is one of the principles of our constitution, *that any number of subjects, not the majority of the state, who seek to redress their own grievances by a hostile resistance to government are always legally punishable by government*. Our author says, his principal intention in this section was to make the following observation, “ the right of ~~the~~ people, (it should be, “ I think, *the people*) to give and grant their “ own money, is the fundamental principle of “ our government.” Most assuredly that proposition expresses a fundamental principle of our government. But it is the people collectively in the supreme legislative assembly, and not the people individually, nor the people in small communities ; for that would imply the following absurdity, that such an individual, or such a community might give such an assistance to the state as he or they thought fit, or none at all, *if they pleased*. In this case, I suspect some of the colonies would adopt sentiments somewhat similar

lar to that of the late Queen Dowager of Spain, who ordered in her will, that when she died she should be buried with her late husband; but she added, *she would rather not die at all.* The simple truth is, that in the British constitution, the people by their collective assembly make a PART OF THE RULING POWER, and in that capacity originate the public supplies, which are DEMANDED by the ruling power from all the subjects. This simple and evident truth shews the great absurdity of the Doctor's question, "Can we with
 " any decency pretend, that when we give to the
 " King *their* money we give him *our* own?" This seems to be a transcript from the Essay of the Philadelphian Farmer, and has been refuted above a year ago. By an abusive application of the words *the King, we, their, and own,* the Doctor here confounds a very plain proposition; for his question, constitutionally amended, amounts to this, *can the legislature pretend, when it demands national supplies from the subjects, that it demands these supplies from the subjects.* To be sure there are some in the east, and others in the west, but they are all equally subjects, upon an equality, as far as physical necessity admits, and the old established forms of the constitution, or rather the essential form of the constitution. *The giving to the King,* I have plainly demonstrated above, is not what it was before the Revolution. It is now according to our constitution a giving to the nation; and the taxes are called the King's taxes, in the same sense that
 the

the ships of war are called the King's ships. Should the colonies give twelve ships of war to the King, in Dr. Price's sense of giving, I doubt very much whether the Parliament would allow of it.

The Doctor entitles his next section, *Of the policy of the War with America*; but instead of making his reasoning correspond to the title, he indulges himself for seven pages together, in a vein of seditious declamation, intermixed with very many incoherent political apophthegms that might stand nearly as well in any other part of his book, as where they are placed. At length he takes himself up, and acknowledges that he has wandered a little from the point he intended principally to insist upon. Among his scattered apophthegms I meet with the following. "All government, even *within* a state, becomes tyrannical as far as it is a needless and wanton exercise of power.—This is what an excellent writer calls GOVERNING TOO MUCH." In governing distant provinces an attention to this remark, he says, is extremely necessary. I conjecture he means, that misgovernment may arise from *governing too much*. But may not misgovernment also arise from governing too little? I will venture to say, that the present misrule in the American colonies has arisen from the latter cause. If former administrations had done their duty, the present disturbances, in all probability, would not have happened. Have not the well-affected

affected in America been calling out for protection these ten years? Have not riots and disorders been numberless during that time. Have not evil-doers, to whom government ought to have been a terror, been exulting and triumphing in the very face of their governors? Our rulers at home too securely imagined, that since the last peace, there was not a spot on the surface of the globe where the inhabitants had greater reason to be contented and happy than in the British American colonies, if perfect security and a rapid afflux of wealth are inducements to happiness. But that afflux of wealth, joined to the instability of government at home, brought on presumption, which broached novel and unconstitutional opinions; and these opinions the deluded colonists are now maintaining with the sword, while their factious abettors are maintaining them here by sophistry. This sophistry may be mere play to our orators at home; but it may be death to the poor colonists in America; therefore my compassion for those colonists, and my regard for the public tranquillity, has made me undertake to expose the false reasoning of Dr. Price, and to illustrate the true principles of the British constitution, upon which, in the capital points, our governors have hitherto acted, though not always with that vigour they ought. For the maintenance of peace and good order in the colonies requires that our rulers should rather *govern a little more.*

Another

Another of the Doctor's positions is, that the war against the rebel colonists "is a contest from which no advantages can possibly be derived?" What! neither to the state nor to the rebels: what a strange kind of war it must be? Thus he reasons on his own position. "Not a revenue. For the provinces of America, when desolated, will afford no revenue; or, if they should, the expence of subduing them and keeping them in subjection will much exceed the revenue.—Not any of the advantages of trade: for it is a folly next to insanity to think trade can be promoted by impoverishing our customers, and fixing in their minds an everlasting abhorrence of us.—It remains *therefore*, that this war can have no other object than the extension of power." This the Doctor may perhaps call reasoning; but it appears to me such reasoning as that of the school-boy, who said the colour of his coat was not black, neither was it red, *therefore* it was yellow. As to his first position, that when the rebels are subdued, the colonies will yield no revenue, the futility of it is evinced by history and fact. Ireland, in the rebellion of 1641, was twenty times more desolated than, it is to be hoped, the colonies will be by the present war; yet it is only since that rebellion that Ireland has afforded a revenue for maintaining its own internal tranquillity, besides large succours to the general defence. I except the two or three turbulent,

lent years in the beginning of King William's reign. But the keeping the colonies in subjection, he thinks, will cost more than they can yield as a revenue. On this I need only observe, that it is not the intention of government to keep the colonies in subjection. Government wants only to quell the rebels, in order that the colonists may enjoy their former freedom; and expects that they should assist in governing and defending themselves according to the fundamental law of the state. For a refutation of the last clause of the Doctor's reasoning, we need only again appeal to the history of Ireland, the trade of which island with Great Britain is by many degrees more extensive now, than it was an hundred and fifty years ago. Because the hearts of rebels are full of animosity, does it follow that the minds of peaceable subjects are the same?

Having bestowed this notice upon one or two of the Doctor's digressional apophthegms, I shall again join him where he leaves off his wandering. In page 58 he returns to the point he intended, he says, principally to insist upon in this section; and tells us, that the American war is impolitic, because it has given occasion for calling into question points of authority and prerogative, which are always likely to suffer by discussion. Now here I doubt not but my readers will differ entirely from the Doctor. Did the prerogative of the people of England *not to have their private property touched by the executive power,*

L

suffer

suffer at all by the discussion of Mr. Hampden? It is of the very nature of truth never to suffer by discussion; and those that want to attack her, first throw a cloak over her, and then calumniate her. False prerogatives indeed will always suffer by discussion, of which we have before seen examples in Dr. Price's not distinguishing the alienable from the inalienable rights of man, in his deeming *rank slavery* what St. Paul dignifies with the name of *freedom*, in his absurd axiom, that *all taxes are free gifts*, &c.

The British government must be unstable indeed, if its authority and prerogatives will not bear discussion; and this very American war, though otherwise most disagreeable, has been productive of one advantage in giving occasions of vindicating the just rights of government, which the more they have been attempted to be shaken, the more they have been found to be firmly supported by truth. And while government has that support, it will ever degrade itself by having recourse to the means of corruption; and yet this very means in this very page the inconsistent Dr. Price insinuates as the best method of governing the colonies. Had government abstained from taxing the colonies, "luxury, he says, and, together with it, their dependence upon us, and our influence in their assemblies, would have increased, till in time perhaps they would have become as corrupt as ourselves." He adds in a note; "This has been our policy with respect to the people of
" *Ireland,*

" *Ireland*, and the consequence is, we now see
 " their Parliament as obedient as we can wish."

I doubt not but many of the popular leaders in America see a great deal of reason in this system of Dr. Price's, and are ready for the golden shower; but our government, not quite so corrupt as our author would seem to wish them, have scorned that expedient, and went upon the fundamental law of the state, *that every subject is bound to support government, not as he pleases, but according to the will of the supreme legislature.* For adhering to this truth what abuse and railing have they not sustained; but all the railing in the world will not prevent the sun from rising, nor invalidate the rights of truth.

Before I proceed farther, I am tempted to shew my readers where Dr. Price rather seems, in the heat of his zeal, to forget his own principles, and to write against himself. "Our governors, he says, ever since I can remember, have been jealous that the colonies, some time or other, would throw off their dependence. This jealousy was not founded on any of their acts and declarations." From hence, I think, we may conclude, that it is Dr. Price's opinion, this jealousy of our governors was altogether groundless. How our governors have spoken and acted, I cannot take upon me to say; but most of my readers, I believe know, that the dependence of the colonies on Great Britain has been a point often agitated by speculative politicians both in America and in Europe, some de-

claring for the affirmative, and some for the negative. Here the Doctor, I say, seems to declare for the negative ; but if we turn back to pages 43 and 44 of his pamphlet we find him pompously espousing the affirmative. “ The probability is, says he, that the colonies will go on “ to increase ; and that in 50 or 60 years, they “ will be *double* our number and form a mighty “ empire, consisting of a variety of states, all “ equal or superior to ourselves in all the arts “ and accomplishments which give dignity and “ happiness to human life.” I may perhaps have misapprehended our author, therefore I pray my readers not to give their verdict till they hear what he has to say, to reconcile these two seemingly opposite opinions.

I must next observe, that the Doctor instead of adhering to the title of his section, again makes another digression of six pages, to give an historical recital of the different acts of administration, in regard to the colonies, for several years past, which acts are pretty fresh in most people’s memories, and may be found in any collection of Magazines, without the party tincture the Doctor has given them. As this retrospective view seems only thrown in as a make-weight to the Doctor’s discourse, and has hardly any manner of connection with the argument of his section, the exposition of the different falsties scattered through it is of little importance. I shall only make a few remarks upon the Doctor’s sally against the conciliatory motion offered
last

last session of Parliament. " A proposal, he
 " says, was sent to the colonies, called concilia-
 " tory ; and the substance of which was, that
 " if any of them would raise such sums as should
 " be demanded of them by taxing themselves,
 " the Parliament would forbear to tax them.—
 " It will be scarcely believed hereafter, that such
 " a proposal could be thought conciliatory. It
 " was only telling them ; *if you will tax your-*
 " *selves BY OUR ORDER, we will save ourselves*
 " *the trouble of taxing you.* They received the
 " proposal as an insult, and rejected it with dis-
 " dain." We have seen before, that by the
 British constitution, it is the supreme legislature
 that demands public taxes from the subject, and
 not individuals and small communities that offer
 those taxes at their pleasure. On this considera-
 tion I doubt not but my readers, notwithstanding
 the new code of laws endeavoured to be
 palmed upon us by Dr. Price and the Pennsyl-
 vanian delegates, will perceive that the concilia-
 tory motion is most strictly conformable to the
 real principles of our constitution, and ought
 never to be abandoned by government, but when
 government abandons the colonies.

If the colonies mean to contribute any thing at
 all to the immediate support of the state, this
 conciliatory motion in its very nature removes
 all pretences for cavilling, or for apprehension of
 vexations. And most assuredly, to decide of
 the HOW MUCH can never belong to colonies.
 The objection, that the supreme legislature,
 were

were it to be ever so zealous to act equitably, cannot judge how much the colonies can afford to pay, is a very weak and futile subterfuge; for, thanks to the most ingenious Sir William Petty, and other calculators, the potency of states, and of communities that are not states, is now computable, and is not such a dark problem to the moderns as it was to our ancestors. I have computed, that a direct revenue of 500,000*l.* from the continental colonies would be about ten pence in the pound of their general income; but where is the mighty wrong or grievance should there be an error of one penny, or two pence in the pound on the whole calculation?

Contrasts, when well managed, are allowed generally to add to the beauty of a picture; and the Doctor, after giving a caricatured *drawing* of the proceedings of government, in respect to the colonies, opposes to it a representation of the conduct of the colonies in the character of subjects. The outline of this representation, almost in every particular, varies from truth, but it will sufficiently prove to my readers what a *political designer* he is, to remark upon two of the enormities of this outline. Why should the poor colonists be asked to pay taxes to the state; for Dr. Price tells us, that, "by purchasing our goods they paid taxes." This argument he uses seriously! But if that be the way of paying taxes, the learned and ingenious Dr. Tucker has shewn that the Germans pay more of our taxes than the

the colonists; for they purchase more of our goods.

Again, he says, "all the gains of the colonists "centered among us." By *us*, I suppose he means the people of Great Britain; and in that case I affirm, that the proposition, though advanced before by Dr. Franklin and Governor Pownal, is a gross falsehood, which shews, that the affirmers of it either meant to mislead by sophistry, or did not give the slightest attention to what they were writing about. I shall suppose the following to be the state of the trade between Great Britain and her American colonies; that we exported the value of 3,000,000*l.* and only received in commodities the value of 2,000,000*l.* in return; and that the remaining million was paid us in gold. This last million would have the good effect of augmenting our specie at home. But how did the colonists get this last million in gold? Only by sending their products and commodities to foreign nations that wanted them; so that the state of the trade is still reducible to this: the colonies receive three millions worth from Great Britain, and send three millions worth in return, one million of which takes a round-about passage, and is a commodity of so unperishable a nature that it may be kept three or four thousand years without spoiling. This has most sagaciously been called, *sending all the gains of the colonies to Great Britain.* But what are the gains of the colonies? The lands that they now occupy, with the houses
on

on those lands, with the stocks of cattle, and valuable household furniture, are worth more to them than one hundred millions sterling; and their annual income from those lands, joined to their own industry, exceeds twelve millions sterling. I know I have greatly under-rated not only the capital stock, but the income; and both these, before this mad revolt, were rapidly augmenting every day. But since seditious principles have been so unrestrainedly propagated, not only by disgraced ministers and place-hunters, but by preachers of the gospel, unacquainted both with the doctrines of the Bible, and the fundamental laws of the British constitution, many of the colonists, as might naturally be expected, have affected to forget from whom they have had those lands, and who have protected them in the quiet enjoyment of them, and in the enjoyment of the same liberties, which the generality of the natives of Great Britain enjoy. Very many of the colonists, however, I am fully persuaded, still remain untainted, and will assist in restoring that tranquility with which their land was blessed before the present disturbances.

The Doctor having his head still full of the false idea, *of all the gains of the colonies, being sent to Great Britain*, continues his candid strictures in the following manner. “Not content-
 “ed with drawing from the colonies a large re-
 “venue *indirectly*, we have endeavoured to pro-
 “cure one *directly* by an authoritative seizure.—
 “Vile policy! What a scourge is government
 “so

“ so conducted !” Here his zeal seems *quite* to have run away with his penetration ; for we have seen that the *authoritative seizure* he speaks of is in the very essence of the supreme legislative power. And as to the scourges of the British government, let us hear the Doctor’s own account of them, two pages after. “ The colonies, he says, taken one with another, double their own number in twenty-five years.— Such an increase was, I believe, never before known. It demonstrates THAT THEY MUST LIVE AT THEIR EASE, and be free from those cares, oppressions, and diseases, which depopulate and ravage luxurious states.” This happy life of the colonists, expressed by the Doctor *by their living at their ease, free from cares*, plainly comprehends nine years (from 1764 to 1773) of the time that he supposes government has been scourging them, from whence, I think, we may safely conclude, that the scourges have been very light. And, indeed, how could they be otherwise, for the stamp-act only asked about 100,000*l.* out of an income of 12 millions, which is about two pence in the pound of that income.

In the very next sentence to that above quoted, page 71, the Doctor displays the most profound ignorance of the nature of commerce, and particularly of the commerce of the colonies. “ With the population of the colonies, he says, has increased their trade ; but much faster, on account of the gradual introduction of lux-

M

“ ury

“ ury among them.” Here we have the effect most ignorantly substituted for the cause; for the rapid progress of the trade of the colonies is so far from being owing to their luxury, that their luxury is owing to that rapid progress. In communities that have not had a long establishment, and that have stocks to form, I deny that luxury can be a lasting and permanent cause of a progressive increase of trade. Should the inhabitants of such communities run upon luxury, they might indeed riot for a few years, at the end of which they would find their fund melting from under them, and themselves sinking into distress. The reverse has been the happy situation of the British colonists, because there were other causes operating among them different from luxury, though luxury in the end became an *effect* of those causes.

Let us first suppose, that the trade of the colonies doubles every twenty-five years, that increase of trade is so far from being owing to luxury, that it is owing to the very contrary, to oeconomy. We have seen, that in the space of twenty-five years their population has doubled; that is the number of families has doubled. But these new families, or *menages*, as the French call them, imply the number of houses being doubled, the quantity of household furniture nearly doubled, the quantity of live-stock augmented, and a much greater quantity of land made to be productive; while the families before established, still continue to be progressively
more

more rich, and the lands before cultivated to be more valuable; all which united doubles the trade of the whole within the above-mentioned period, by industry and oeconomy, and not by luxury.

But the accounts of the exports and imports shew us, that the trade of the colonists has increased much faster than their population, and this the Doctor ignorantly attributes to the introduction of luxury among them. Will his *ipse dixit*, however, or confident assertion suffice for a proof with the discerning reader? He indeed, seems to be perfectly persuaded that it will, his performance is so full of short dogmas standing without any proof, very similar for their truth and peremptoriness to the two I first took notice of, "that in a free state every man is his own legislator; all taxes are free gifts, &c." The trade of the colonists, like the trade of all nations, is owing to the productiveness of their lands, joined to their own industry; but if their lands are extremely productive, as we know those of the Carolinas and Virginia are, if the supreme legislature of the state, from a blameable inattention, demands no taxes from the colonies, and grants bounties in their favour, the operation of which may procure them preferable markets, even in competition with the merchants of other parts of the empire; the natural consequence is, that the husbandmen and merchants in the colonies may be gaining *cent. per cent.* while the husbandmen and merchants

in Great Britain are gaining perhaps but 15 *per cent.* by the same traffic ; and the colonists not knowing what to do with the wealth that is flowing in upon them so abundantly, act like wise men, and give vent to a part of it in luxury. Government has so scourged them that *they live at their ease, and are free from those cares, oppressions, and diseases which depopulate and ravage luxurious states* ; though they may nevertheless venture to taste a little of luxury as a pleasing gratification of life.

The Doctor, after indulging himself in some lugubrious declamation, proceeds to view his subject, as he says, in a new light ; but whether this be a true light or a false light my readers will soon judge. He begs leave to give a *distinct* account of the present SINGULAR situation of this kingdom ; he means, though he does not express it, in regard to the quantity of money both real and nominal, in regard to the national credit, the balance of trade, and the public revenue. He advances many erroneous opinions upon all those points ; so that on the whole, his *distinct* account may be ranked among the most *indistinct* that have appeared for a long time past. His desultory observations on real and nominal money, and on public credit, give not the least new useful information upon a subject that has been scrutinized with much more judgment by Sir James Stewart, Mr. Hume, and other writers, some of whose sentiments the Doctor barely repeats in a miserable, disjointed, incor-
rect

rect style. But let us see more particularly how lamely, nay how factiously and seditiously our author treats of the above mentioned points.

I shall first arrange some of his propositions relating to real and nominal money and public credit. “ The whole specie of the kingdom is
 “ probably at this time about fourteen or fifteen
 “ millions.—Coin is the basis of our paper credit :—As far as in any circumstances specie is
 “ not to be procured in exchange for paper, it
 “ represents *nothing*, and is worth *nothing*. —
 “ The specie of this kingdom is generally believed to be inconsiderable, compared with the
 “ amount of the paper circulating in it; and
 “ therefore it is natural to enquire how its currency is supported.——It is supported in the
 “ same manner with all other bubbles. Were
 “ all to demand specie in exchange for their
 “ notes, payment could not be made.—Were
 “ our public credit annihilated, it would become impossible to pay the taxes. The revenue would fail. Near a hundred and forty millions of property would be destroyed.
 “ The whole frame of government would fall to pieces, and a state of nature would take place.
 “ What a dreadful situation! It has never had
 “ a parallel among mankind except at one time
 “ in France by the breaking of the Royal Mississippi Bank. Happily for that kingdom
 “ they have shot this gulph. Paper credit has
 “ never since recovered itself there; and their
 “ circulating cash consists now all of solid coin.
 “ —This

“ —This gives them unspeakable advantages,
 “ and joined to that quick reduction of their
 “ debts, which is inseparable from their very
 “ nature, places them on a ground of safety
 “ which we have reason to admire and envy.—
 “ Their debts consist chiefly of money raised on
 “ annuities on lives, short annuities, anticipa-
 “ tions of taxes for short terms,” &c.

Such is the abstract of his *distinct* account of
 the situation of the kingdom in regard to the a-
 bove mentioned points, from whence he con-
 cludes, we ought to tremble for the danger of
 the nation, and that when rioters assemble in an
 hostile manner, and will not hearken to the re-
 monstrances of the magistrate, he ought not to
 think of quelling them, but of *retreating*. Now
 a few words will suffice to shew that his account
 is erroneous, is partial, in wholly omitting to
 contrast the situation of the rebels in those points,
 with the situation of subjects in Great Britain,
 and is of a very seditious tendency.

“ The whole specie of the kingdom, he be-
 “ lieves to be about fifteen millions.” But I
 remember Lord North, upon very solid reason-
 ing, when recapitulating the transactions about
 the recoinage, concluded that the specie of the
 kingdom was several millions more. I shall
 however take it only at sixteen millions, and
 suppose the inhabitants of Great Britain eight
 millions. This will give us a proportion of
 money of forty shillings to each inhabitant. The
 nominal money, in currency, I shall suppose to
 be

be four times as much. Let this be the situation of Great Britain. Now let us look into the situation of the colonies. Among all the rebel colonists there is not probably 100,000l. in specie, which, shared among two millions of people, is in the proportion of one shilling to each inhabitant. Here we find a difference of forty to one in favour of Great Britain. But the rebels have begun a paper coinage, and supposing this paper money at two millions, the nominal among them will be to the real as twenty to one, which gives another difference of five to one in favour of Great Britain. I leave the Doctor to compute the advantage in favour of Great Britain by compounding the ratios.

"Coin, he tells us, is the basis of our paper credit." Most assuredly, as rum is the basis of good punch. Now it appears, that if in Great Britain they make their punch by adding four measures of water to one of spirit, the rebels are now making theirs by putting twenty waters to one measure of spirit. Punch drinkers will easily decide which is the most invigorating.

"As far, he says, as *in any circumstances* specie is not to be procured in exchange for paper, it represents *nothing*, and is worth *nothing*." The first thing that strikes here is the inaccuracy of the style, for according to the common manner of writing, the Doctor's meaning should be that *specie represents nothing*; but I shall suppose he means that paper represents *nothing*. Then, I say, his proposition is false,
and

and of a very seditious tendency. Suppose I should have a true bond for one thousand pounds, and upon an emergency, for the Doctor talks of *any circumstances*, I want to borrow 500l. upon it, but cannot meet with any lender, is my bond therefore *worth nothing*? What self-confidence a man must have to advance such palpable nonsense! But farther, let us suppose all the Bankers in London, at the moment when they have the greatest quantity of paper in circulation, should contrive to stop payment, with a view to defraud the holders of their notes, would not Parliament, as in the case of the South-Sea Directors, make the estates of those Bankers answerable for their paper-obligations; and it is no great presumption to reckon those estates equivalent to a capital of ten millions sterling*. We have indeed lately had experience, that some have ventured to coin bastard bank-notes upon no other fund than their impudence; but in this kind of traffic, as in all others, the maxim must be *caveat emptor*, the dealer must beware. It would be most wretched logic, however, to conclude, as Dr. Price has done, that because one house in Oxford-street had a rotten foundation, therefore all the houses in London have rotten foundations. When Dr. Price takes upon him to af-

* The policy of throwing out the bill for making Bankers estates liable for their debts, appeared to me altogether incomprehensible. To provide against an evil by a previous law, is certainly preferable to the redressing it by an *ex post facto* law.

firm,

firm, " that the currency of the paper circulating in this kingdom is supported in the same manner with *all other bubbles*," it is evident he dares to make such an affirmation in defiance of common-sense and plain reason; but the defiance of the law is rather a little more perilous, though, in fact, not more disgraceful than the other.

As the paper-money issued by the rebels is altogether illegal, I think one may safely say, that it is a COMPLETE BUBBLE; and those who shall be the possessors of it when peace is restored, will find to their cost, that they possess what is *worth nothing*. According to the expression of Plautus, "*suo periculo is emat, qui eam mercabitur.*"

" Were our public credit annihilated, he says, it would become impossible to pay the taxes." By *public credit*, I suppose he means, the *national debts*, and, in that case, I say, that this is another false and absurd proposition. In the first place, were the public debts annihilated, that would not sweep away the twentieth part of our fund; and we should have but little more than half the present taxes to raise, which (forgetting his present assertion) he mentions himself two pages afterwards, consequently there would be no difficulty in raising them. I have said that the annihilation of our public debts would not sweep away the twentieth part of our fund, and the following reflections will make that evident. The burden of the public debts

N

is

is not in the capital of 124 millions; but in the annual interest paid to the public creditors, which we shall suppose is four millions and an half. Now it may be proved, that the present annual income of the nation exceeds one hundred millions, therefore should a public bankruptcy take place, the annual income on that account would not be diminished much more than four millions and an half; for all those who were not public creditors might very nearly spend in their usual manner. A fortnight's rain in the corn and hay harvests, I affirm, would lessen the national income more than the deficiency of four millions and an half of annual rents. I could enlarge a great deal more upon the subject of the national debt; but for many reasons I judge it prudent to forbear, what I have said being sufficient to over-turn the Doctor's position.

He seems to place the supposed capital of the public debts on the same footing with the nominal or paper money circulating through the kingdom, and lumps it all under the name of paper-currency, which, though a common opinion, is extremely erroneous. The public debts are transferable; but so are lands and houses; yet that does not make them money, in the common acceptance of the word. Should I have a great deal of money in a chest with two different locks, and only possess the key of one of those locks, I could not be said to command my money at my pleasure. This is precisely the case of the national debts. No public creditor can
draw

draw his money out of the public funds, unless he meets with some other person ready to put in as much as he draws out : therefore our public debts and funds circulating in the alley cannot properly be called paper-currency ; for nearly the same quantity of nominal money might circulate in the nation without those debts as with them.

We may now see what judgment we ought to form of his terrific threat, " the whole frame of " government would fall to pieces and a state of " nature would take place." Did a state of nature take place after the bankruptcy of the Mississippi Company in France, which he says, " is a parallel case to our supposed national " bankruptcy, though somewhat less severe in " its consequences there, than a like bankrupt- " cy would be here ;" which shews that he is but very little acquainted with the state of the two countries. The bankruptcy of the Mississippi Company in France occasioned many a tearful eye, and the grand-children and great-grand-children of those creditors who suffered, still feel the sad effects of that breach of faith, which robbed their ancestors of ample fortunes, that might now have been theirs. But did France, as a community, suffer in any great degree by that bankruptcy ? Very little more, I believe, than by the loss of the battle of Blenheim, which occasioned many a tearful eye in that kingdom likewise. Dr. Price therefore seems to have been at a loss for a phrase, when he affirmed,

that a *state of nature* would follow a public bankruptcy in England. For were a public bankruptcy to happen this year, there would not, in all probability, next year, be one acre of wheat less, one load of hay less, one yard of cloth less, than if such an event had not happened. Neither would the number of horses, of cattle, of sheep, be at all diminished. How fantastic and wild then must that imagination be, which can fancy, that a deficiency of revenue to the amount of four millions and an half, which does not imply a deficiency of subsistence, would instantly bring the inhabitants of this island to a *state of nature*. Not only the natural resources of the nation, but the good faith for which the British legislature has hitherto been distinguished, removes all apprehensions of the Doctor's *state of nature* during the present crisis.

“ Happily for France, says our author, paper credit has never since recovered itself in that kingdom.” This is his opinion; but it is very different from that of many of the best of their own political writers, particularly of the author of the essay *Sur le Commerce des Grains*, who has several very judicious ideas upon the advantages that his nation might reap from nominal money, under proper restrictions and regulations. The Doctor, with his usual inaccuracy, leaves his readers to guess, whether by the words *paper credit* he means public credit or private credit. “ The want of paper-money, joined to the quick reduction of their debts, places

“ places the French, he says, on a ground of
 “ safety, which we have reason to admire and
 “ envy.” But are there no shades at all in this
 fair picture ? I am afraid the Doctor, like some
 of our travellers, has ventured to praise a picture
 he never saw. But let me enumerate some of
 the shades. The French having no paper-money
 are *moins pecunieux*, or less monied than we are ;
 and certainly money, either real or nominal, is
 an excellent oil for facilitating the motion of the
 machine of state ; the *perception*, or expence of
 levying their taxes, is so enormous, that it has
 been computed that of 24 *livres* raised upon the
 people, hardly 12 go into the *coffres du Roi*, or
 treasury. The Marquis de Mirabeau goes so
 far as to think the King gets only one third of
 the *ferme* of tobacco, which he divides in the
 following manner, 33 millions raised upon the
 people, 11 of which to the King, 11 to the
fermiers generaux, or contractors for the tax, and
 11 to the *commis* for levying it. Here then, on
 account of management alone, France has an
 annual burden of above two millions, that Great
 Britain is exempted from. In a town where we
 may have three or four excisemen, the French
 would have forty revenue officers, some for the
gabelle or salt-duty, others for the *aides*, or wine-
 duty ; others for the *taille* or arbitrary tax on
 land and stock ; and others for other branches,
 all unconnected with each other. Great part of
 their debt likewise, though it has not the name
 of debt, consists in *charges et offices*, or employ-
 ments,

ments, most of them nominal, paid by the state for money formerly lent to it. The English reader will have some idea of this, if he supposes 20,000 Justices of the peace obliged to pay 1000 l. a piece for their places; for which the government is to allow them 50 l. a year. Some of their ministers, within these few years have made an attempt to remove this burden, but without success. On the contrary, so scanty are the supplies of the state, in comparison of the demands, and so low is its credit, that its ministers, though they have *made* several LOANS since the peace, were obliged within these five years to stop the payment of all pensions; and monied men, rather than lend to them at 6 *per cent.* lent to monasteries at the *quarantieme denier*, or two and an half *per cent.* Dr. Price may now, if he pleases, *admire and envy the ground of safety upon which the French stand*, with a perpetual annual incumbrance of near four *millions* a year, which they know not how to shake off*.

* In some pieces published a few months ago by Voltaire, under the title of *Lettres Chinoises, Indiennes, et Tartares*, he pretends, that France loses every year 974 millions of livres, or about 42 millions sterling, by the impolitic and excessive mode of taxation on the three articles of salt, wine, and tobacco. Voltaire, as a good citizen, would, no doubt, be greatly rejoiced to see an ample demonstration from Dr. Price, *that France stands on a ground of safety, which England has reason to admire and envy.* But I would advise Dr. Price to be better acquainted with the subject before he undertakes the demonstration.

The

The war against the rebels, the Doctor thinks, may affect the ballance of our trade ; but his speculations on that point lead him only to conclude, that it has a tendency to affect that ballance, which ballance is, in its very nature, so very complicated, that experience alone can decide. " All know, he says, that the ballance of trade " with the colonists is greatly in our favour ;" and why should it not ? But is it not also greatly in favour of the colonists ? I affirm that it is. This may appear a paradox ; but upon examination, I believe, will be found to be an evident truth. Let us suppose a planter in Carolina receives a grant of one hundred acres for the annual quit-rent of half-a-crown, he may easily raise from that plantation 500 l. worth of rice, which sent to Italy, or Spain, will sell for 600 l. and this 600 l. purchases manufactures in Great Britain, which cost the English merchant only 500 l. Thus the merchants in both countries gain 20 *per cent.* and the colonist in Carolina, for what he reaps *in one year* from lands bestowed upon him by Great Britain, becomes possessor of as many manufactures, as the same hands employed upon his farm, had they been manufacturers, could not have made *in two years*. If this is not profit, I do not know what ought to be called profit ; and this accounts for the rapid accumulation of wealth among the colonists ; yet Dr. Price, Governor Pownal, and Dr. Franklin, tell us, *that the gains of all the colonists center*

in

in Great Britain! How long has the nation been bubbled by an ignorant or partial representation of facts!

The Doctor next prognosticates a deficiency in the revenue from the attempt to reduce the rebels; but he founds this upon his preceding doubtful position of the ballance of our trade being affected by that war. But as the ballance of trade veers like the wind, his conclusions, of course, are merely conjectural. Should the war in America continue longer than is expected; if, at the same time, the fisheries on our own coasts become more extensive; and the supply of provisions to the West Indies proceeds regularly from Great Britain, the nation, notwithstanding a diminution in the ballance of trade, will find an increase of internal vigour, which is ever the chief thing to be attended to, and forms the real strength of kingdoms.

During the continuance of every war, both the contending parties certainly risk profits as well as lives; and the Doctor, to have argued sensibly on the policy of the war with the rebellious colonists, ought to have examined candidly, which party run the greatest risk. The point of right has already been debated; therefore let us now only ask, is it politic to urge the right? Is it politic to suffer factious subjects to take upon them to redress their own grievances; and to renounce obedience to government whenever they please? Is it politic to suffer fifty ringleaders to reign as tyrants over the well-affected subjects among the colonists,
and

and to assume to regulate the trade of Great Britain? Because the rebels are very wilful from truth not getting access to them, does it follow from thence that they are very strong? We have seen their comparative weakness in point of money. It is also evident in point of shipping. I will venture to say, also in point of military discipline, and most certainly in point of numbers. Therefore to parody an expression of our author's, *REBELS on an edge so perilous, should think of nothing but submission.*

The Doctor, in his fourth section of this second part, proposes to treat *of the honour of the nation as affected by the war with America.* But surely he might have saved himself that trouble; for if he has proved this kingdom the aggressor in an unrighteous quarrel, and that it is impolitic to carry on the war, he need not doubt but every one will agree with him, that it must be dishonourable to pursue it. As he has however most miserably failed in proving the two first points, we may therefore conclude, that the honour of the nation is not at all affected by the war against the rebels.

Having little to say on this subject, he again beats over the same ground of sophistry about one country and another country, which has already been shewn to be an entire mis-stating of the question, as the territory on which the colonists are seated was acknowledged to be part of the dominion of Great Britain, before any of
 O them

them ever possessed it, and they are every year receiving new grants of that said dominion; and the very principle of all their settlements is an obedience to the supreme legislature of the state.

The Doctor next condescends to give us some more proofs of his ignorance of history, "The united provinces of Holland, he says, were once subject to the Spanish monarchy;" but by acts of government were driven to resistance.

This is a subject that has often been referred to by the seditious; and Governor Pownall, I believe, has bestowed above an hundred pages upon it, with much disquisition, but I am sorry to say without much discernment. The case however is no way parallel with colonists refusing obedience to the supreme legislature, for the Netherlands never were subject to the Spanish monarchy, as has been explained to the public above a year ago. They stood in the same relation to Spain that Hanover stands to Great Britain, that is, the heirs of the Duke of Burgundy, in consequence of marriages, became Kings of Spain. It was so common an opinion in Queen Elizabeth's time, and in the beginning of the last century, that people belonged to the King or sovereign, that the popular error of the Netherlands being subject to Spain is descended from one generation to another. But the Netherlands themselves knew better; and I have met but with one English author who has had the good sense to remark the distinction. Carew, who wrote his Survey of Cornwall before
Queen

Queen Elizabeth's death, says " Philip, Arch-
 " duke of Austria, during his voyage from Ne-
 " therland to Spain, *his wife's kingdom*, was
 " weather-driven into Plymouth."

What a precious thing history is in some people's hands! When it makes directly against their opinion they can quote it for their opinion. This the Doctor has again done in the case of the social war against the Romans, by which he shews his ignorance both of the British constitution and of the Roman. I will venture to affirm, that the British colonists now in rebellion, enjoyed much more valuable liberties before their revolt than the social confederates obtained, and gladly acquiesced in, after they had experienced all the calamities of war. What did they obtain? That they should be called Roman citizens, and when any of their inhabitants CAME TO ROME, they should have a full right with any other Romans to give their votes for the election of magistrates; but to render this nugatory, they were so classed as to form eight tribes out of forty-three. The consequence was, that it only augmented the *turba forensis* and *capite censi* at Rome; for the blackguards of the social towns, who could not live at home, acquired some importance by residing at the capital, where they became the vile instruments of every ambitious leader.

The author, who has so ignorantly misapplied two historical cases, refers a few pages afterwards to the case of Ireland, which he seems to under-

stand as little as that of the Netherlands, or of the social war. It has been shewn in the *Right of the British Legislature vindicated*, that Ireland never was an English colony. There is this great difference between the Irish and the colonists, that the Irish under Henry II. actually gave their lands to the crown of Great Britain, whereas it is the crown of Great Britain that bestows lands upon the colonists. Had there not been frequent rebellions in Ireland, there might at this moment not have been one thousand English families in all that island, and the Irish language might have been the general language at Dublin; yet that kingdom would still have been under the same subordination as at present.

The Irish, as a distinct nation confederated with us, may claim privileges different from those of colonists; but, on the other hand, the colonists as colonists, enjoy privileges superior to those of the Irish, in being under the immediate superintendence of the supreme legislature, which has been to them worth many millions; for to that superintendence, the colonists, I will venture to say, have owed their prosperity and affluence more than to any other cause. There has been no wall of partition between them and the sunshine of government, from which sunshine the Irish have been most impolitically excluded for these hundred years past. Several years ago I endeavoured to represent both the justice and the policy of removing that partition between Great Britain and Ireland, which would most certainly promote

promote the prosperity of both islands; and it is with the greatest pleasure I now see that very important object beginning to attract the attention of government*.

The colonies, our author says, are persuaded they are fighting for liberty, and Dr. Price does all in his power to fortify them in that false persuasion, by arguments founded on a mistaken theory, and by principles that any knot of smugglers or banditti may urge in justification of their proceedings. But *I do not like the government, therefore I may oppose it*, is a very dangerous logic for any thousand or hundred thousand to maintain in the face of eight or ten millions, though it would be very sound logic in the mouth of the millions. My wishes are to see the rebel colonists conquered by truth, rather than by the sword; but if they will weakly exclude the promulgation of truth among them, and give a willing ear to false and pernicious doctrines, it is not to be wondered

* Dr. Price gives us in a note a maxim of Mr. Mollineux's, from his Case of Ireland's being bound by acts of Parliament in England. This golden saying is, "I have no other notion of slavery, but being bound by a law to which I do not consent;" from whence my readers will naturally conclude, that Mr. Mollineux has been as ignorant of the nature of liberty and slavery as Dr. Price has shewn himself to be. There is much more specious learning than sound reasoning in Mr. Mollineux's book, and an excellent refutation of it was published in 1698, by Mr. Coke of Bristol, which I would recommend to Dr. Price's perusal; it is intitled, *The History and Reasons of the Dependency of Ireland upon the imperial Crown of the kingdom of England, rectifying Mr. Mollineux's State of the Case, &c.*

that

that they run upon destruction. They are however very deserving of pity ; but whether they will one day think their tempters and seducers deserving of thanks, I shall leave to their own decision. Few of us, I believe, think ourselves obliged to the seducer of Eve, who is the first haranguer upon record, that urged the *inalienable right* of man to be his own legislator.

The Doctor seriously advances, that the war against the rebels is disgraceful, because foreign troops are to be employed in it. But for the same reason all the wars the nation has been engaged in these hundred years are disgraceful. For my own part I am very sorry that foreign troops are hired, because I think the military force that this nation could afford to raise and keep up, would have been sufficient for quelling the revolvers, with the assistance of another ally, whom we might have had at a cheaper rate. The ally I mean is Time. But the discussion of this point falls in more properly with the examination of the Doctor's fifth and last section, which is intitled, *Of the probability of succeeding in the War with America.*

I did not know before, that we had been at war with America, any more than with Africa. But I suppose by America the Doctor means some fellow-subjects in that part of the world now in arms against government ; and in that case I think there is the greatest probability of success on the side of government. This the
Doctor

Doctor himself shall prove to my readers by his own positions, when they are freed from their absurdities and self-contradictions, and explained by a natural and unforced commentary. " Let the force, he says, employed by government be 40,000 effective men ; the revoltors have half a million of men to oppose to it : " according to him therefore " it is a folly so great, that language does not afford a name for it, to think of conquering that whole continent with 40,000 men, to be transported across the Atlantic, and fed from hence, and incapable of being recruited after any defeat."

To view and consider these positions distinctly, we must first throw off the rubbish from them ; for that the troops are to be fed from hence, and incapable of being recruited after any defeat, are mere gratis assumptions of the Doctor's. He tells us, that the government army is to be opposed by half a million of determined men, fighting on their own ground within sight of their houses and families. But how does he form this half a million ? By draughting every fourth person out of two millions of men, women, and children. This may breed a wonder in a school-boy ; but does the author seriously think such arguments can make any impression but that of contempt upon those who are experienced in life.

All the able bodied men of a country, or in other words, a quarter of the inhabitants, is much more than the half of the strength of a country ; and yet we found in the late war only a quarter,

or

or not quite a quarter of our strength or 26 millions, employed every year, was near overwhelming us, and could not have been exerted unless artificially on account of our accumulated wealth. Indeed, if the colonists will come into the field only with bows and arrows, and pass the campaign without clothing, and without victuals, one fourth of them may almost be counted upon for fighting men. In other respects it is ridiculous to reckon the number of their troops that can act offensively from the number of their men capable of bearing arms. The Russians, towards the end of their late war, made a levy of one man of fifty persons which was rather reckoned a high proportion. When wars were carried on by tumultuary armies, each man bringing the arms of his own manufacture, made at his own fire-side, numerous troops might appear in the field for a few weeks once a year, or once in two years. But as wars are at present carried on, a great part of those concerned in them never once appear in the field, but remain at home preparing implements of death, and other necessaries for the rest. Those implements are so very expensive, that the labour of many years must go to the preparation of them, and vast sums of money are necessary for the purchase of the very materials. In this view the arsenals of Woolwich and Portsmouth alone, in aid of ten thousand men, are a counter-balance for fifty thousand men ill provided for war. The Doctor may perhaps alledge, that his half a million are not

not to appear in one field; but to take arms occasionally as their service is required. In that case they stand only as a body to recruit from; and, when they take the field, must march many hundred miles from the sight of their own houses and families. Government, on the other hand, recruits from two millions and an half of able-bodied men in Britain and Ireland, and one million and an half in Germany, in all four millions, which is a superiority of eight to one, besides the operation of its fleet; and the great preponderancy in its favour by the abundance of warlike stores it possesses. The Doctor I hope will graciously allow our fleet to stand for something. I shall compute its annoyance at only a fifth of the whole. This will make the effective strength of government against the rebels 50,000 men, to which if we add those employed at home in co-operating for the supply of that force both with men and with stores, we may reckon the whole amount to be equivalent to 60,000 men on the field of action. Now as this is not to be a temporary armament, but to be continued unremittingly, till a pacification takes place, it may well be regarded as much more formidable than a tumultuary army of 100,000 men.

What are those 60,000 men to subdue? Two millions of people scattered over a country as extensive as all Germany, all Holland and Flanders, and all France, from the mouth of the Elbe on the north, to the Pyrenean mountains on the south; and among those two millions the go-

P

vernment

vernment troops have many thousands of zealous friends ready to join them. The impossibility of recruiting the army is such an absurdity as answers itself; and as to the manner of the troops being supplied with provisions, I shall only observe, that the probability is, they will make their quarters good somewhere; and that in the last war provisions were even sent from England to feed the French army in Westphalia; I mean the corn exported from Norfolk was bought by the Dutch and sold to the French commissaries. While Admiral Hawke likewise cruised in Quiberon Bay, he was supplied with water from England, which was computed to have cost above three pence a quart. All these considerations induce me to conclude, that the strength which Great Britain can exert would suffice, with the assistance of time, to put an end to the war without foreign aid. But there may nevertheless be many most substantial reasons, which I am unacquainted with, for preferring a great force in a short time to a smaller force in a longer time.

Though the British colonists in America are scattered over a country as extensive as all Germany, all Holland and Flanders, and all France; yet Dr. Price, in defiance of the truth of history, again brings the colonies in comparison with the Netherlands. "In the Netherlands, he says, a few states *thus circumstanced* withstood for thirty years the whole force of the Spanish monarchy." Were the seventeen provinces of the

the Netherlands *thus circumstanced*, I mean so circumstanced as our colonists? In no sense of these words, is the case of our colonies to be compared with that of the Netherlands. We have seen that in point of *right*, nothing but the grossest ignorance can think there is any relation. Let us now see how the parallel holds in point of force. The inhabitants of the seventeen provinces were probably double the number of our colonists; and instead of being scattered from the Elbe to the Pyrenean mountains, their force was concentrated in a small country full of fortified towns, where not only the report of the cannon might be heard, but the flash might be seen from one garrison to another. This country is likewise very much intersected by rivers and arms of the sea, and a great portion of it is nothing but a large swamp. The inalienable right of man, in regard to religion, had then been most violently invaded all over Europe, which created a most bitter animosity of one half against the other, and procured the new Protestants of the seven confederated Provinces thousands of friends in England, Scotland, Germany and France. They had all Protestant Germany at their back, from whence probably they drew ten thousand recruits every year. The Queen of England and the King of France each assisted them with a body of troops; and the Scots, who for near two thousand years have been distinguished for their attachment to the military profession, crowded thither in great numbers, as they did

afterwards to the standards of Gustavus Adolphus, to the number of twenty thousand. The Netherlanders then, in fact, may be said to have recruited from above twenty millions of people, and from the accumulated wealth of ages had a purse nearly equal to that of their adversary. Can then the case of the revolted colonists in America be paralleled with the least justice or the least propriety with that of the Hollanders? I will almost appeal even to Doctor Price.

The case of the Syracusans and Greek colonists, mentioned by our author, I fancy, will likewise be found to be as little applicable as that of the Netherlands. I have not at present opportunity to enquire into the nature of the Greek colonies; but I apprehend they were not sent out with a form of laws to the remote dominions of the parent state under her protection; but were sent out, as our first parents were sent out of Paradise with the world all before them,

————— where to choose
Their place of rest, and Providence their guide.

They seem to have been small detachments, separated from the parent state, as their name implies, *αποικοι*, or *people from home*; and we find them in Thrace, and in Magna Græcia declaring war and peace with their neighbours, and with each other, which soon brought the former under the power of Philip of Macedon, and the latter under the power of the Romans.

The four or five following pages of the Doctor's observations are too rich in absurdities to pass

pass them without some remarks. "The colonists, he tells us, are determined either to give up to our resentment or destroy themselves such of their maritime towns as they cannot guard against our fleets, the consequence of which will be, that these towns will be rebuilt in safer situations.—As to their trade having all the necessities and the chief conveniences of life within themselves,—the loss of it will do them unspeakable good." Here then at one stroke the Doctor overturns the greatest part of his pretended reasoning! The colonists are to reap unspeakable benefits from this war! What are those benefits? I believe such as most of the colonists would wish to be excused from. They are a preservation from the evils of luxury and the temptations of wealth.

"The restraining act, he says, will furnish them with a reason for confiscating the estates of all the friends of our government among them." What! if those friends should not take any active part; but as *nonjurors* only refuse taking the oaths to the new government? That surely could not be the country meant by the Doctor's prophecy, "where the friends of liberty in every quarter of the globe are to find a safe retreat from civil and spiritual tyranny." But my readers are now pretty well acquainted with our author's inconsistencies, and therefore I do not expect they will be much astonished here. The well-affected to government among the colonists have but too many proofs, that
what

what furnishes them reasons for thankfulness has furnished the rebels reasons for outrage ; but Dr. Price's hint, I hope, will furnish reasons to our rulers for confiscating the estates of those who have taken an active part in the present rebellion.

The restraining act, he tells us, rendering their ships (consisting of *many* hundreds) useless, they will be turned into ships of war. With how much ease the Doctor gives them a navy superior to that of Great Britain, who contents herself with little more than a couple of hundreds of ships of war. But where are all the ships of the rebels to come from ; for he has told us that their defenceless maritime towns, which we did not destroy, they themselves are to destroy. He may perhaps allege, that their new maritime towns will be high up upon navigable rivers. It may be so ; but I think it is probable that if their ships can get out, our ships may get in. He may still answer, that he does not reason much upon probabilities ; and to this I have no reply.

The loss of their trade, and the having all their ports shut up, which he tells us from his own certain knowledge has long been the wish of the wisest men among the colonists, according to him, is to prepare the way for their quickly becoming a great maritime power, aye, and much more than he has words to express. This reflection awakens in him some kind of a religious sentiment, which I shall give my readers, involved in his own ambiguous words. " None, he says, who know me, can believe
" me

“ me to be disposed to superstition. Perhaps,
 “ however, I am not, in the present instance,
 “ free from that weakness.—I fancy I see in
 “ in these measures, something that cannot be
 “ accounted for merely by human ignorance.
 “ I am inclined to think, that the hand of Pro-
 “ vidence is in them working to bring about
 “ some great ends.” Wonderful superstition !
 Who that believes a superintending Providence
 is not FIRMLY PERSUADED that the prosperity
 and calamity of nations, and the revolutions of
 states are under the influence and direction of the
 infinitely supreme Power ; but our author only
fancies he sees ; and thinks an apology necessary
 for his superstitious weakness.

The Doctor before he concludes, recapitulates
 some of his arguments, which he means to give
 very sharp and pointed ; but whether they are
 penetrating my readers may judge. “ I am
 “ hearing it, he says, continually urged, *are*
 “ *they not our subjects ?*—The plain answer is,
 “ they are not your subjects. The people of
 “ America are no more the subjects of the people
 “ of Britain than the people of Yorkshire are
 “ the subjects of the people of Middlesex.
 “ They are your *fellow-subjects*.” I am glad to
 hear, that they are subjects at all ; and pray
 Doctor in what sense are they fellow-subjects but
 in being subject to the same supreme legislature with
 ourselves ? In another sense the French are our
 fellow-subjects ; for they are subject to some le-
 gislature or other, and they are also our fellow-
 men ;

men ; but certainly the colonists are not our fellow-subjects in the same sense as the French.

The Doctor here again has recourse to the figure *amphibologia*, or *double meaning*, by using terms susceptible of various interpretation. When he says, "the colonists are not your subjects," if he means they are not the subjects of the Common Council of London, I perfectly agree with him, though some of the colonists have lately had the meanness to seek for a redress of grievances at that fountain, when the healing fountain was not above three miles farther, nay, I believe, was even three miles nearer. The terms *our* subjects, and *your* subjects, give nothing but confused ideas, and a clear reasoner would have avoided them. The true question ought to be, are colonists who go to settle on the remote dominions of the parent state subject to the supreme legislature of that state ? But it serves the purpose of sedition to jumble the subjection to the legislature, which is truly constitutional, with a subjection to individuals, which does not exist.

"But we are taxed, and why should not they be taxed ?" ~~is~~ another question our author supposes put to him, which he answers in the following manner. "You are taxed by yourselves. They insist on the same privilege." Here again the author continues at his bush-fighting, and renders both his question and answer ambiguous by using *we* and *they*, *you* and *yourselves*, which may be interpreted variously.

The

The word *we*, according to the constitution, must stand for the King, Lords, and Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled, and the word *they* must import the subjects of that Parliament, our fellow-subjects in America. So that when he says, *they* insist upon being *we*, it is the same thing as if he had said, the subjects in America insist upon being supreme legislators, otherwise they are slaves.

But notwithstanding all the ignorant and factious assertions of Dr. Price, *not to possess the same, or an equal degree of liberty, can never be construed into slavery*. Are there no degrees at all betwixt the rank and fortune of a lord and beggary? But what do I talk of beggary? Dr. Price tells us, that without liberty, that is, without a will in the supreme legislature, *man is a beast* *. He forgets, I suppose, that he is writing to men. May not I esteem myself rich with a sack-full of diamonds, without having one of the diamonds of the royal crown added to them? This case is precisely applicable to the British colonists in America. They have all their sack-full of diamonds when compared to every other dependent people on earth; but Messieurs Dickenson, Hancock, and Adams, and Drs. Franklin and Price, have put it into their heads to whine and cry for one of the diamonds of the royal crown, which I suspect they will cry long enough for, without ever obtaining it.

* Observations, page 95.

The Doctor again supposes the following objection made to him, " but they will not obey " the *Parliament* and the *laws*." He advises the objector to say rather, " they will not obey *your* " *Parliament* and *your* laws, because they say they " have no voice in your *Parliament*, they have " no share in making your laws." So then, upon Dr. Price's authority, all those who have no voice in *Parliament*, I shall suppose he means, in forming the representative part of it, need not obey its laws. Admirable doctrine! *The Parliament is not perfect*, THEREFORE it has no AUTHORITY, is a proposition that will ever bring destruction upon those who maintain it actively, till they get the majority of the nation to be of their opinion. The colonists, the Doctor says, have no share in making the laws of the state. What then? They have their share in the benefit of those laws. In no state on this globe have all the subjects a share in making the laws; and that has before been shewn to be founded on the very nature of man. It is the happiness of the colonists that they can justly say the British *Parliament* is *their Parliament*, even in a more direct sense than the Irish can; for they have ever since their first establishment felt the benign influences of the direct rays of that *Parliament* more than the Irish, who have most impolitically been suffered to remain in the shade.

" If the colonists can subsist without you, " says the Doctor, is their aiming at independence to be wondered at? Did their ever " exist

“ exist a community, or even an individual, that would not do the same ?” This, I think, may very properly be called *sedition direct*; and may with great ease be formed into the following proclamation. O ye, either communities or individuals, who find the laws inconvenient to you, Dr. Price assures you, it will not be wondered at, if you aim at an independence on those laws. Most people, I fancy, will think that this ought to be proclaimed from some other high place than the pulpit. But in fact the case is too common to be any cause of wonder. There never existed an age when evil-doers were prodigies. Were there to be no evil-doers, there would not be the least occasion for any civil government; but God knowing that there would be many evil-doers upon earth, has ordained government. And government, expecting that there may be evil-minded persons inclined to depend on the laws, only so far as they think fit, is supposed to be always ready prepared to punish them. What is the object of government but to make *the most happy, and the fewest wretched*; therefore it is the general welfare, and not a partial welfare that government is to study, and when any small part dare disturb the public tranquillity, they must expect the public resentment for that attempt. Therefore to preach up the liberty of daring, without mentioning the consequences of that daring, is truly a diabolical province, as weak minds may thereby be seduced into the commission of the blackest of crimes.

The Doctor concludes his whole performance with the sketch of a plan of pacification, proposed in the House of Lords by Lord Shelburne, which plan he adopts as his own, after bestowing some encomiums both upon it and its author. I wish he had confined his encomiums to the author of the plan, and then he would probably have been seconded by every man of letters in Great Britain, as that Nobleman, with a spirit truly worthy of his rank, has shewn that he can distinguish and reward literary merit. I lament that the great talents of Lord Shelburne are not more directly employed in the service of his country; but as to his plan, I find it altogether a leaky vessel, that will not hold water. It is indeed held together by two imaginary hoops, which fall to pieces in the very attempt to examine them; and when these hoops are gone, the weakness of the whole becomes very evident.

The first proposal it contains is, "Meet the colonies on their own ground, in the last petition from the congress to the King; the surest as well as most dignified mode of proceeding for this country." Now to compare great things with small, I shall illustrate that proposition by a fact which lately happened in Great Britain. Within these two months a foreign vessel was wrecked, or rather bulged on the western coast of this island. The Justices of the peace, with some gentlemen of the neighbourhood, upon the first intelligence of the misfortune

fortune, went on board the vessel to check the audacity of the mob, who might assemble to pillage. The crowd of pillagers was quickly very great, upon which the Justices read the riot act from the ship, and threatened them with the rigour of the law if they did not disperse. The rioters however were not to be put off so; they had conceived that they had a RIGHT to pillage, and instead of dispersing, they began to argue the point with the Justices. Suppose they had withdrawn to some distance and chosen *delegates*, would it have been proper, would it have been constitutional for the Justices of the peace to have met those delegates on *their own ground*, and to have deliberated on propositions offered from them?

To meet the rebels on the ground of a petition from the congress, what is it else but to begin with the confirmation of the direct violation of all their charters. No persons sitting at Philadelphia, have any more right to take upon themselves the direction of the affairs of New-York, of Virginia, or of Carolina, than to direct the affairs of Spain or of Germany. New York is as independent on Pensylvania as on China; and Virginia has no more right to give law to Carolina than to Barbadoes or Jamaica. That the rebels are willing to have it so, will not alter the constitution of their charters; and their acting in direct opposition to those charters is a manifest forfeiture of all of them. Are subjects who take upon them to redress their own
grievances

grievances by force of arms, public enemies, or are they not? While such subjects take upon them to oppose the will of the majority, the only claim they have, is a claim to the highest punishment. Their forming a system among themselves will not give them any rights. As the acts of the rebel colonists are an *ipso facto* forfeiture of their charters, the first ground of a restoration of government and tranquility among them must be new charters granted by act of Parliament, and not an attention to any propositions from men who have no authority to make propositions. From what has been said, my readers, I doubt not, will conclude, that the meeting the rebels on the ground of a petition from the congress, instead of being a sure or dignified mode of proceeding, would, in fact, be a mode equally impolitic and dishonourable.

The second hoop of this plan is composed of as unsubstantial materials as the first. "The right of judging, it is said, not only of the mode of raising, but of the *quantum*, and the appropriation of such aids as they shall grant, is among those fundamental inalienable rights of *Englishmen*, which no father can surrender on the part of his son, no representative on the part of his elector, no generation on the part of the succeeding one." All this but too evidently contradicts, not only the principles of the British constitution, but I believe of every constitution of civil government on earth, both ancient and modern. We have seen above in page 24, & seq. the

the most plain and direct proofs from the English history, that public taxes in our state have ever been obligatory upon the subject, and always under the direction of the executive power till the Revolution, when they became the objects of Parliamentary direction. But at no time were they under the direction of individuals ; and indeed, it is contrary to the very nature of civil society that they should. To rank such a right among the inalienable rights of human nature, is only a proof that the author has not scrutinized those rights ; for this right, so far from being inalienable, is always surrendered the moment a man becomes a member of civil society. In Great Britain there is not a Lord, nor a member of the House of Commons, that can say, he would not have been taxed, if he had not given his own consent. How comes it then, that this inalienable right is found every where alienated ? It is a demonstration *ex absurdo* that the proposition is false.

Public taxes are nothing else but the general aid of the whole society, for the defence of the society, to be directed in the first instance by the legislative will, or legislative prudence, which is the all-pervading attracting power, that brings the force into cohesion and union, and is the first spring that gives it efficacy. This force would be no force at all, if every individual had a right to give only what degree of aid he thought proper, or in the words of the plan, were to judge, "not only of the *mode* of raising, but of the
" *quantum*

" *quantum* of such aids as he grants." A block of Portland stone, when pounded, becomes nothing but white sand : this sand, by the means of glue may again be made to assume the form of the stone ; but would it have the strength of the stone ? No : the principle of cohesion having been destroyed, it would, when put to the trial, prove nothing but sand.

Did the free Romans leave it in the will of individuals to give to the state, only what aids they thought proper ? We find they did not. On the contrary ; though they admitted none but *freemen* into their legions, those freemen were in a manner always pressed men, that is, when they were called out, they had not the right of refusing. Those among them who took upon themselves to judge of the *mode* and *quantum* of their aids to the state not only forfeited their property, but suffered corporal punishment ; and in consequence of refusing pecuniary aids, they forfeited their *liberty* as well as their *property**.

The

* Qui ad nomina non respondissent, partim virgis cæsi, partim in vincula ducti. *Liv. lib. 7.*

Marcus Curius Consul cum subitum delectum edicere coactus esset, Polliæ nomen urna extractum citari iussit, neque eo respondente, bonâ adolescentis hastæ subiecit. *Val. Max.*

Populus cum *vendit* eum, qui miles factus non est, non adimit ei libertatem, sed judicat non esse eum liberum, qui ut liber sit, adire periculum noluit. Cum autem incensum vendit, hoc judicat, cum ii, qui in justâ servitute fuerint, censu liberentur, eum, qui cum liber esset, censi noluerit, ipsum sibi libertatem abjudicavisse.

The Gauls were still more rigorous; for, with them, tardiness in the public defence was death. Cæsar tells us, “ hoc more Gallorum est initium belli, quo lege communi omnes puberes armati convenire coguntur; et qui ex iis novissimus venit in conspectu multitudinis, omnibus cruciatus necatur.” That is, in the beginning of a war among the Gauls, all the youth capable of serving as soldiers, are, by a fundamental law, obliged to assemble in arms; and he that comes last to the rendezvous, is put to death by all manner of tortures, in presence of the rest.

It would seem that those Gauls had no notion of the inalienable right of a subject to judge *how far*, or *in what manner* he should assist the state. Neither had the ancient Roman republicans any such notion. Neither had the English nation any such notion, till they began to misapprehend their own constitution in the time of Charles I. as appears from the fullest evidence above produced in pages 26, 30, & seq. Some erroneous opinions, advanced in the beginning of the last century by party zealots, having been inadvertently adopted by Mr. Locke, the sanction of his name, and of his authority, has made men of excellent understandings ab-

se. *Cic pro Cæcina.* Here we see that a free man, *qui noluit censeri*, who would not submit to be taxed, was deemed to have abdicated his liberty, and to have made himself a slave; but according to the fine modern doctrine, with which the nation has been abused these twelve years, all who submit to be taxed are slaves.

R

stain

tain from applying their reason to the examination of those propositions, which appear glaring absurdities when candidly discussed. My regard for truth exceeds my veneration for Mr. Locke, and for all the great names in the world; and * therefore I endeavoured, two years ago, to point out the fallacy of his proposition in regard to taxation, which has misled thousands to their ruin. That propositions of the same tendency have been again advanced in one of the most august assemblies of the nation, by men of superior abilities, is not much to be wondered at; for prejudices, however false and groundless, take some time to be dispelled; and but too little attention has been bestowed to give the point of RIGHT all that constitutional and historical proof of which it is susceptible.

Errores ad sua principia referre est refellere.
To refer errors to their principles, is to refute errors; and such has been my object in my present examination of Dr. Price's sophistry. As he has taken the liberty, which our free constitution allows, of examining public measures, I have likewise taken the liberty of scrutinizing his opinions. The more I have sifted his performance, the more I have found it to consist of chaff. Bold assumptions, expressed in a petulant intemperate style, are almost in every page of it substituted for calm discussion and clear reasoning. Throughout the whole, the poison of sedition is distributed in very large doses,

* *Rights of the British Legislature vindicated.*

which

which may have a most pernicious effect upon the unwary and over-credulous. I have therefore thought, that to expose the shallow artifices of the seducer, and to provide such an antidote as may render his poison ineffectual, would be a service both useful and acceptable to the public.

F I N I S.

Published by the same Author.

- I. **A** Comparative View of the Public Burdens of Great Britain and Ireland, with a Proposal for putting both Islands on an Equality in regard to the Freedom of Foreign Trade.
- II. An Essay concerning the Establishment of a National Bank in Ireland.
- III. Remarks on the New Essay of the Pennsylvanian Farmer, and on the Resolves and Instructions prefixed to that Essay.
- IV. The Right of the British Legislature to tax the American Colonies vindicated; and the Means of asserting that Right proposed. Second Edit.

